

Counting Triangles under Updates in Worst-Case Optimal Time

Ahmet Kara¹, Hung Q. Ngo², Milos Nikolic³, Dan Olteanu¹, Haozhe Zhang¹

¹University of Oxford ²RelationalAI, Inc. ³University of Edinburgh

March 26, 2019

Abstract

We consider the problem of incrementally maintaining the triangle count query under single-tuple updates to the input relations. We introduce an approach that exhibits a space-time tradeoff such that the space-time product is quadratic in the size of the input database and the update time can be as low as the square root of this size. This lowest update time is worst-case optimal conditioned on the Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication conjecture.

The classical and factorized incremental view maintenance approaches are recovered as special cases of our approach within the space-time tradeoff. In particular, they require linear-time maintenance under updates, which is suboptimal. Our approach can also count all triangles in a static database in the worst-case optimal time needed for enumerating them.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of incrementally maintaining the result of the triangle count query

$$Q() = \sum_{a \in \text{Dom}(A)} \sum_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} R(a, b) \cdot S(b, c) \cdot T(c, a) \quad (1)$$

under single-tuple updates to the relations R , S , and T with schemas (A, B) , (B, C) , and (C, A) , respectively. The relations are given as functions mapping tuples over relation schemas to tuple multiplicities. A single-tuple update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to relation R maps the tuple (α, β) to a nonzero multiplicity m , which is positive for inserts and negative for deletes.

The triangle query and its counting variant have served as a milestone for worst-case optimality of join algorithms in the centralized and parallel settings and for randomized approximation schemes for data processing. They serve as the workhorse showcasing suboptimality of mainstream join algorithms used currently by virtually all commercial database systems. For a database \mathbf{D} consisting of R , S , and T , standard binary join plans implementing these queries may take $O(|\mathbf{D}|^2)$ time, yet these queries can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time [2]. This observation motivated a new line of work on worst-case optimal algorithms for arbitrary join queries [20]. The triangle query has also served as a yardstick for understanding the optimal communication cost for parallel query evaluation in the Massively Parallel Communication model [17]. The triangle count query has witnessed the development of randomized approximation schemes with increasingly lower time and space requirements, e.g., [11].

A worst-case optimal result for incrementally maintaining the exact triangle count query has so far not been established. Incremental maintenance algorithms may benefit from a good range of processing techniques whose flexible combinations may make it harder to reason about optimality. Such techniques include algorithms for aggregate-join queries with low complexity developed for the non-incremental case [19]; pre-materialization of views that reduces maintenance of the query to that of simpler subqueries [16]; and delta processing that allows to only compute the change in the result instead of the entire result [8].

1.1 Existing Incremental View Maintenance (IVM) Approaches

The problem of incrementally maintaining the triangle count has received a fair amount of attention. Existing exact approaches require at least linear time in worst case. After each update to a database \mathbf{D} , the naïve approach joins the relations R , S , and T in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ using a worst-case optimal algorithm [2, 20] and counts the result tuples. The number of distinct tuples in the result is at most $|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}}$, which is a well-known result by Loomis and Whitney from 1949 (see recent notes on the history of this result [19]). The classical first-order IVM [8] computes on the fly a delta query δQ per single-tuple update δR to relation R (or any other relation) and updates the query result:

$$\delta Q() = \delta R(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} S(\beta, c) \cdot T(c, \alpha), \quad Q() = Q() + \delta Q().$$

The delta computation takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time since it needs to intersect two lists of possibly linearly many C -values that are paired with β in S and with α in T (i.e., the multiplicity of such pairs in S and T is nonzero). The recursive IVM [16] speeds up the delta computation by precomputing three auxiliary views representing the update-independent parts of the delta queries for updates to R , S , and T :

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ST}(b, a) &= \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} S(b, c) \cdot T(c, a) \\ V_{TR}(c, b) &= \sum_{a \in \text{Dom}(A)} T(c, a) \cdot R(a, b) \\ V_{RS}(a, c) &= \sum_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} R(a, b) \cdot S(b, c). \end{aligned}$$

These three views take $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^2)$ space but allow to compute the delta query for single-tuple updates to the input relations in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Computing the delta $\delta Q() = \delta R(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$ requires just a constant-time lookup in V_{ST} ; however, maintaining the views V_{RS} and V_{TR} , which refer to R , still requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. The factorized IVM [21] materializes only one of the three views, for instance, V_{ST} . In this case, the maintenance under updates to R takes $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time, but the maintenance under updates to S and T still takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time.

Further exact IVM approaches focus on acyclic conjunctive queries. For free-connex acyclic conjunctive queries, the dynamic Yannakakis approach allows for enumeration of result tuples with constant delay under single-tuple updates [14]. For databases with or without integrity constraints, it is known that a strict, small subset of the class of acyclic conjunctive queries admit constant-time update, while all other conjunctive queries have update times dependent on the size of the input database [5, 6].

Further away from our line of work is the development of dynamic descriptive complexity, starting with the DynFO complexity class and the much-acclaimed result on FO expressibility of the maintenance for graph reachability under edge inserts and deletes, cf. a recent survey [22]. The k -clique query can be maintained under edge inserts by a quantifier-free update program of arity $k - 1$ but not of arity $k - 2$ [24].

A distinct line of work investigates randomized approximation schemes with an arbitrary relative error for counting triangles in a graph given as a stream of edges, e.g., [3, 15, 7, 18, 9]. Each edge in the data stream corresponds to a tuple insert, and tuple deletes are not considered. The emphasis of these approaches is on space efficiency, and they express the space utilization as a function of the number of nodes and edges in the input graph and of the number of triangles. The space utilization is generally sublinear but may become superlinear if, for instance, the number of edges is greater than the square root of the number of triangles. The update time is polylogarithmic in the number of nodes in the graph.

A complementary line of work unveils structure in the PTIME complexity class by giving lower bounds on the complexity of problems under various conjectures [13, 23].

Definition 1 (Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication (OMv) [13]). *We are given an $n \times n$ Boolean matrix \mathbf{M} and receive n column vectors of size n , denoted by $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$, one by one; after seeing each vector \mathbf{v}_i , we output the product $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}_i$ before we see the next vector.*

Conjecture 2 (OMv Conjecture, Theorem 2.4 in [13]). *For any $\gamma > 0$, there is no algorithm that solves OMv in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-\gamma})$.*

The OMv conjecture has been used to exhibit conditional lower bounds for many dynamic problems, including those previously based on other popular problems and conjectures, such as 3SUM and combinatorial Boolean matrix multiplication [13]. This also applies to our triangle count query: For any $\gamma > 0$ and database of domain size n , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains the triangle count under single-tuple updates with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(n^{1-\gamma})$ update time, and $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\gamma})$ answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails [5].

1.2 Our Contribution

This paper introduces IVM^ϵ , an incremental view maintenance approach that maintains the triangle count in amortized sublinear time. Our main result is as follows:

Theorem 3. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ incrementally maintains the result of Query (1) under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time, constant answer time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.*

The preprocessing time is for computing the triangle count on the initial database before the updates; if we start with the empty database, then this time is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. The IVM^ϵ approach exhibits a tradeoff between space and amortized update time, cf. Figure 1.

IVM^ϵ uses a data structure that partitions each input relation into a heavy part and a light part based on the degrees of data values. The degree of an A -value a in relation R is the number of B -values paired with a in R . The light part of R consists of all tuples (a, b) from R such that the degree of a in R is below a certain threshold that depends on the database size and ϵ . All other tuples are included in the heavy part of R . Similarly, the relations S and T are partitioned based on the degrees of B -values in S and C -values in T , respectively. The maintenance is adaptive in that it uses different evaluation strategies for different heavy-light combinations of parts of the input relations that overall keep the update time sublinear. Section 3 introduces this adaptive maintenance strategy.

As the database evolves under updates, IVM^ϵ needs to rebalance the heavy-light partitions to account for a new database size and updated degrees of data values. While this rebalancing may take superlinear time, it remains sublinear per single-tuple update. The update time is therefore amortized. Section 4 discusses the rebalancing strategy of IVM^ϵ .

For $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, IVM^ϵ achieves the lowest update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ while requiring $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ space. This update time is optimal conditioned on the OMv conjecture. For this, we specialize the lower bound result in [5] to refer to the size $|\mathbf{D}|$ of the database:

Proposition 4. *For any $\gamma > 0$ and database \mathbf{D} , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains the result of Query (1) under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*

This lower bound is shown in Appendix C. Theorem 3 and Proposition 4 imply that IVM^ϵ incrementally maintains the triangle count with optimal update time:

Corollary 5 (Theorem 3 and Proposition 4). *Given a database \mathbf{D} , IVM^ϵ incrementally maintains the result of Query (1) under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with worst-case optimal amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and constant answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*




Figure 1: IVM^ϵ 's space and amortized update time parameterized by ϵ . The classical IVM is recovered by setting $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. The factorized IVM is recovered by setting $\epsilon_R \in \{0, 1\}$, $\epsilon_S = 0$, and $\epsilon_T = 1$ when V_{ST} is materialized (similar treatment when V_{RS} or V_{TR} is materialized). For $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, IVM^ϵ counts all triangles in a static database in the worst-case optimal time for enumerating them.

IVM^ϵ also applies to triangle count queries with self-joins, such as when maintaining the count of triangles in a graph given by the edge relation. The space and time complexities are the same as in Theorem 3 (Appendix B).

IVM^ϵ defines a continuum of maintenance approaches that exhibit a space-time tradeoff based on ϵ . As depicted in Figure 1, the classical first-order IVM and the factorized IVM are specific extreme points in this continuum. To recover the former, we set $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ for $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ update time and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ space for the input relations. To recover the latter, we use a distinct parameter ϵ per relation: for example, using $\epsilon_R \in \{0, 1\}$, $\epsilon_S = 0$, and $\epsilon_T = 1$, we support updates to R in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time and updates to S and T in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time; the view V_{ST} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^2)$ space (Appendix A).

We observe that at optimality, IVM^ϵ recovers the worst-case optimal time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ of non-incremental algorithms for enumerating all triangles [20]. Whereas these algorithms are monolithic and require processing the input data in bulk and all joins at the same time, IVM^ϵ achieves the same complexity by inserting $|\mathbf{D}|$ tuples one at a time in initially empty relations R , S , and T , and by using standard join plans (Appendix A).

2 Preliminaries

Data Model. A schema \mathbf{X} is a tuple of variables. Each variable X has a discrete domain $\text{Dom}(X)$ of data values. A tuple \mathbf{x} of data values over schema \mathbf{X} is an element from $\text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{X \in \mathbf{X}} \text{Dom}(X)$. We use uppercase letters for variables and lowercase letters for data values. Likewise, we use bold uppercase letters for schemas and bold lowercase letters for tuples of data values.

A relation K over schema \mathbf{X} is a function $K : \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ mapping tuples over \mathbf{X} to integers such that $K(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for finitely many tuples \mathbf{x} . We say that a tuple \mathbf{x} is in K , denoted by $\mathbf{x} \in K$, if $K(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$. The value $K(\mathbf{x})$ represents the multiplicity of \mathbf{x} in K . The size $|K|$ of K is the size of the set $\{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in K\}$. A database \mathbf{D} is a set of relations, and its size $|\mathbf{D}|$ is the sum of the sizes of the relations in \mathbf{D} .

Given a tuple \mathbf{x} over schema \mathbf{X} and a variable X in \mathbf{X} , we write $\mathbf{x}[X]$ to denote the value of X in \mathbf{x} . For a relation K over \mathbf{X} , a variable X in \mathbf{X} , and a data value $x \in \text{Dom}(X)$, we use $\sigma_{X=x}K$ to denote the set of tuples in K whose X -value is x , that is, $\sigma_{X=x}K = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in K \wedge \mathbf{x}[X] = x\}$. We write $\pi_X K$ to denote the set of X -values in K , that is, $\pi_X K = \{\mathbf{x}[X] \mid \mathbf{x} \in K\}$.

Query Language. We express queries and view definitions in the language of functional aggregate queries (FAQ) [1]. Compared to the original FAQ definition that uses several commutative semirings, we define our queries using the single commutative ring $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ of integers with the usual addition and multiplication. A query Q has one of the two forms:

1. Given a set $\{X_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ of variables and an index set $S \subseteq [n]$, let \mathbf{X}_S denote a tuple $(X_i)_{i \in S}$ of variables and \mathbf{x}_S denote a tuple of data values over the schema \mathbf{X}_S . Then,

$$Q(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \sum_{x_{f+1} \in \text{Dom}(X_{f+1})} \cdots \sum_{x_n \in \text{Dom}(X_n)} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{M}} K_S(\mathbf{x}_S), \text{ where:}$$

- \mathcal{M} is a multiset of index sets.
 - For every index set $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $K_S : \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}_S) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a relation over the schema \mathbf{X}_S .
 - $\mathbf{X}_{[f]}$ is the tuple of free variables of Q . The variables X_{f+1}, \dots, X_n are called bound.
2. $Q(\mathbf{x}) = Q_1(\mathbf{x}) + Q_2(\mathbf{x})$, where Q_1 and Q_2 are queries over the same tuple of free variables.

In the following, we use \sum_{x_i} as a shorthand for $\sum_{x_i \in \text{Dom}(X_i)}$.

Updates and Delta Queries. An update δK to a relation K is a relation over the schema of K . A single-tuple update, written as $\delta K = \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto m\}$, maps the tuple \mathbf{x} to the nonzero multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any other tuple to 0; that is, $|\delta K| = 1$. The data model and query language make no distinction between inserts and deletes – these are updates represented as relations in which tuples have positive and negative multiplicities.

Given a query Q and an update δK , the delta query δQ defines the change in the query result after applying δK to the database. The rules for deriving delta queries follow from the associativity, commutativity, and distributivity of the ring operations.

Query $Q(\mathbf{x})$	Delta query $\delta Q(\mathbf{x})$
$Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdot Q_2(\mathbf{x}_2)$	$\delta Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdot Q_2(\mathbf{x}_2) + Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdot \delta Q_2(\mathbf{x}_2) + \delta Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdot \delta Q_2(\mathbf{x}_2)$
$\sum_x Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1)$	$\sum_x \delta Q_1(\mathbf{x}_1)$
$Q_1(\mathbf{x}) + Q_2(\mathbf{x})$	$\delta Q_1(\mathbf{x}) + \delta Q_2(\mathbf{x})$
$K'(\mathbf{x})$	$\delta K(\mathbf{x})$ when $K = K'$ and 0 otherwise

Computation Time. Our maintenance algorithm takes as input the triangle count query Q and a database \mathbf{D} and maintains the result of Q under a sequence of single-tuple updates. We distinguish the following computation times: (1) *preprocessing time* is spent on initializing the algorithm using \mathbf{D} before any update is received, (2) *update time* is spent on processing one single-tuple update, and (3) *answer time* is spent on obtaining the result of Q . We consider two types of bounds on the update time: *worst-case bounds*, which limit the time each individual update takes in the worst case, and *amortized worst-case bounds*, which limit the average worst-case time taken by a sequence of updates. Enumerating a set of tuples with constant delay means that the time until reporting the first tuple, the time between reporting two consecutive tuples, and the time between reporting the last tuple and the end of enumeration is constant. When referring to sublinear time, we mean $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ for some $\gamma > 0$, where $|\mathbf{D}|$ is the database size.

Computational Model. We consider the RAM model of computation. Each relation (view) K over schema \mathbf{X} is implemented by a data structure that stores key-value entries $(\mathbf{x}, K(\mathbf{x}))$ for each tuple \mathbf{x} over \mathbf{X} with $K(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ and needs space linear in the number of such tuples. We assume that this data structure supports (1) looking up, inserting, and deleting entries in constant time, (2) enumerating all stored entries in K with constant delay, and (3) returning $|K|$ in constant time. For instance, a hash table with chaining,

where entries are doubly linked for efficient enumeration, can support these operations in constant time on average, under the assumption of simple uniform hashing.

For each variable X in the schema \mathbf{X} of relation K , we further assume there is an index structure on X that allows: (4) enumerating all entries in K matching $\sigma_{X=x}K$ with constant delay, (5) checking $x \in \pi_X K$ in constant time, and (6) returning $|\sigma_{X=x}K|$ in constant time, for any $x \in \text{Dom}(X)$, and (7) inserting and deleting index entries in constant time. Such an index structure can be realized, for instance, as a hash table with chaining where each key-value entry stores an X -value x and a doubly-linked list of pointers to the entries in K having the X -value x . Looking up an index entry given x takes constant time on average, and its doubly-linked list enables enumeration of the matching entries in K with constant delay. Inserting an index entry into the hash table additionally prepends a new pointer to the doubly-linked list for a given x ; overall, this operation takes constant time on average. For efficient deletion of index entries, each entry in K also stores back-pointers to its index entries (as many back-pointers as there are index structures for K). When an entry is deleted from K , locating and deleting its index entries takes constant time per index.

Data Partitioning. We partition each input relation into two parts based on the degrees of its values. Similar to common techniques used in databases to deal with data skew, our IVM approach employs different maintenance strategies for values of high and low frequency.

Definition 6 (Relation Partition). *Given a relation K over schema \mathbf{X} , a variable X from the schema \mathbf{X} , and a threshold θ , a partition of K on X with threshold θ is a set $\{K_h, K_l\}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{union}) \quad & K(\mathbf{x}) = K_h(\mathbf{x}) + K_l(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}) \\ (\text{domain partition}) \quad & (\pi_X K_h) \cap (\pi_X K_l) = \emptyset \\ (\text{heavy part}) \quad & \text{for all } x \in \pi_X K_h : |\sigma_{X=x} K_h| \geq \frac{1}{2} \theta \\ (\text{light part}) \quad & \text{for all } x \in \pi_X K_l : |\sigma_{X=x} K_l| < \frac{3}{2} \theta \end{aligned}$$

The set $\{K_h, K_l\}$ is called a *strict partition* of K on X with threshold θ if it satisfies the union and domain partition conditions and the following strict versions of the heavy part and light part conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{strict heavy part}) \quad & \text{for all } x \in \pi_X K_h : |\sigma_{X=x} K_h| \geq \theta \\ (\text{strict light part}) \quad & \text{for all } x \in \pi_X K_l : |\sigma_{X=x} K_l| < \theta \end{aligned}$$

The relations K_h and K_l are called the *heavy* and *light parts* of K .

Definition 6 admits multiple ways to (non-strictly) partition a relation K on variable X with threshold θ . For instance, assume that $|\sigma_{X=x} K| = \theta$ for some X -value x in K . Then, all tuples in K with X -value x can be in either the heavy or light part of K ; but they cannot be in both parts because of the domain partition condition. If the partition is strict, then all such tuples are in the heavy part of K .

The strict partition of a relation K is unique for a given threshold and can be computed in time linear in the size of K .

3 IVM^ε: Adaptive Maintenance of the Triangle Count

We present IVM^ε, our algorithm for the incremental maintenance of the result of Query (1). We start with a high-level overview. Consider a database \mathbf{D} consisting of three relations R , S , and T with schemas (A, B) , (B, C) , and (C, A) , respectively. We partition R , S , and T on variables A , B , and C , respectively, for a given threshold. We then decompose Query (1) into eight skew-aware views expressed over these relation parts:

$$Q_{rst}() = \sum_{a,b,c} R_r(a,b) \cdot S_s(b,c) \cdot T_t(c,a), \quad \text{for } r, s, t \in \{h, l\}.$$

Query (1) is then the sum of these skew-aware views: $Q() = \sum_{r,s,t \in \{h,l\}} Q_{rst}()$.

Materialized View Definition	Space Complexity
$Q() = \sum_{r,s,t \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_r(a,b) \cdot S_s(b,c) \cdot T_t(c,a)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{RS}(a,c) = \sum_b R_h(a,b) \cdot S_l(b,c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{ST}(b,a) = \sum_c S_h(b,c) \cdot T_l(c,a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{TR}(c,b) = \sum_a T_h(c,a) \cdot R_l(a,b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 2: The definition and space complexity of the materialized views in $\mathbf{V} = \{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\}$ as part of an IVM^ϵ state of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

IVM^ϵ adapts its maintenance strategy to each skew-aware view Q_{rst} to ensure amortized update time that is sublinear in the database size. While most of these views admit sublinear delta computation over the relation parts, few exceptions require linear-time maintenance. For these exceptions, IVM^ϵ precomputes the update-independent parts of the delta queries as *auxiliary materialized views* and then exploits these views to speed up the delta evaluation.

One such exception is the view Q_{hhl} . Consider a single-tuple update $\delta R_h = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to the heavy part R_h of relation R , where α and β are fixed data values. Computing the delta view $\delta Q_{hhl}() = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_h(\beta, c) \cdot T_l(c, \alpha)$ requires iterating over all the C -values c paired with β in S_h and with α in T_l ; the number of such C -values can be linear in the size of the database. To avoid this iteration, IVM^ϵ precomputes the view $V_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$ and uses this view to evaluate $\delta Q_{hhl}() = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$ in constant time.

Such auxiliary views, however, also require maintenance. All such views created by IVM^ϵ can be maintained in sublinear time under single-tuple updates to the input relations. Figure 2 summarizes these views used by IVM^ϵ to maintain Query (1): V_{RS} , V_{ST} and V_{TR} . They serve to avoid linear-time delta computation for updates to T , R , and S , respectively. IVM^ϵ also materializes the result of Query (1), which ensures constant answer time.

We now describe our strategy in detail. We start by defining the state that IVM^ϵ initially creates and maintains upon each update. Then, we specify the procedure for processing a single-tuple update to any input relation, followed by the space complexity analysis of IVM^ϵ . Section 4 gives the procedure for processing a sequence of such updates.

Definition 7 (IVM^ϵ State). *Given a database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$ and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, an IVM^ϵ state of \mathbf{D} is a tuple $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$, where:*

- N is a natural number such that the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$ holds. N is called the *threshold base*.
- $\mathbf{P} = \{R_h, R_l, S_h, S_l, T_h, T_l\}$ consists of the partitions of R , S , and T on variables A , B , and C , respectively, with threshold $\theta = N^\epsilon$.
- \mathbf{V} is the set of materialized views $\{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\}$ as defined in Figure 2.

The initial state \mathcal{Z} of \mathbf{D} has $N = 2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}| + 1$ and the three partitions in \mathbf{P} are strict.

By construction, $|\mathbf{P}| = |\mathbf{D}|$. The size invariant implies $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ and, together with the heavy and light part conditions, facilitates the amortized analysis of IVM^ϵ in Section 4. Definition 6 provides two essential upper bounds for each relation partition in an IVM^ϵ state: The number of distinct A -values in R_h is at most $\frac{N}{\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon} = 2N^{1-\epsilon}$, i.e., $|\pi_A R_h| \leq 2N^{1-\epsilon}$, and the number of tuples in R_l with an A -value a is less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$, i.e., $|\sigma_{A=a} R_l| < \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$, for any $a \in \text{Dom}(A)$. The same bounds hold for B -values in $\{S_h, S_l\}$ and C -values in $\{T_h, T_l\}$.

3.1 Preprocessing Stage

The preprocessing stage constructs the initial IVM^ϵ state given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 8. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, constructing the initial IVM^ϵ state of \mathbf{D} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time.*

Proof. We analyze the time to construct the initial state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of \mathbf{D} . Retrieving the size $|\mathbf{D}|$ and computing $N = 2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}| + 1$ take constant time. Strictly partitioning the input relations from \mathbf{D} using the threshold N^ϵ , as described in Definition 6, takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. Computing the result of the triangle count query on \mathbf{D} (or \mathbf{P}) using a worst-case optimal join algorithm [20] takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time. Computing the auxiliary views V_{RS} , V_{ST} , and V_{TR} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, as shown next. Consider the view $V_{RS}(a, c) = \sum_b R_h(a, b) \cdot S_l(b, c)$. To compute V_{RS} , one can iterate over all (a, b) pairs in R_h and then find the C -values in S_l for each b . The light part S_l contains at most N^ϵ distinct C -values for any B -value, which gives an upper bound of $|R_h| \cdot N^\epsilon$ on the size of V_{RS} . Alternatively, one can iterate over all (b, c) pairs in S_l and then find the A -values in R_h for each b . The heavy part R_h contains at most $N^{1-\epsilon}$ distinct A -values, which gives an upper bound of $|S_l| \cdot N^{1-\epsilon}$ on the size of V_{RS} . The number of steps needed to compute this result is upper-bounded by $\min\{|R_h| \cdot N^\epsilon, |S_l| \cdot N^{1-\epsilon}\} < \min\{N \cdot N^\epsilon, N \cdot N^{1-\epsilon}\} = N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}$. From $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follows that computing V_{RS} on the database partition \mathbf{P} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time; the analysis for V_{ST} and V_{TR} is analogous. Note that $\max_{\epsilon \in [0, 1]} \{1 + \min\{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}\} = \frac{3}{2}$. Overall, the initial state \mathcal{Z} of \mathbf{D} can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time. \square

The preprocessing stage of IVM^ϵ happens *before* any update is received. In case we start from an empty database, the preprocessing cost of IVM^ϵ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

3.2 Processing a Single-Tuple Update

We describe the IVM^ϵ strategy for maintaining the result of Query (1) under a single-tuple update to the relation R . This update can affect either the heavy or light part of R , hence we write δR_r , where r stands for h or l . We assume that checking whether the update affects the heavy or light part of R takes constant time. The update is represented as a relation $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, where α and β are data values and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Due to the symmetry of the triangle query and auxiliary views, updates to S and T are handled similarly.

Figure 3 shows the procedure `APPLYUPDATE` that takes as input a current IVM^ϵ state \mathcal{Z} and the update δR_r , and returns a new state that results from applying δR_r to \mathcal{Z} . The procedure computes the deltas of the skew-aware views referencing R_r , which are δQ_{rhh} (Line 3), δQ_{rhl} (Line 4), δQ_{rlh} (Line 5), and δQ_{rll} (Line 6), and uses these deltas to maintain the triangle count (Line 7). These skew-aware views are not materialized, but their deltas facilitate the maintenance of the triangle count. If the update affects the heavy part R_h of R , the procedure maintains V_{RS} (Line 9) and R_h (Line 12); otherwise, it maintains V_{TR} (Line 11) and R_l (Line 12). The view V_{ST} remains unchanged as it has no reference to R_h or R_l .

Figure 3 also gives the time complexity of computing these deltas and applying them to \mathcal{Z} . This complexity is either constant or dependent on the number of C -values for which matching tuples in the parts of S and T have nonzero multiplicities.

Proposition 9. *Given a state \mathcal{Z} constructed from a database \mathbf{D} for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ maintains \mathcal{Z} under a single-tuple update to any input relation in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. We analyze the running time of the procedure from Figure 3 given a single-tuple update $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of \mathbf{D} . Since the query and auxiliary views are symmetric, the analysis for updates to S and T is similar.

We first analyze the evaluation strategies for the deltas of the skew-aware views Q_{rst} :

- (Line 3) Computing δQ_{rhh} requires summing over C -values (α and β are fixed). The minimum degree of each C -value in T_h is $\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon$, which means the number of distinct C -values in T_h is at most $\frac{N}{\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon} = 2N^{1-\epsilon}$. Thus, this delta evaluation takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time.

APPLYUPDATE($\delta R_r, \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_h, R_l, S_h, S_l, T_h, T_l\}, \{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\})$	
3 $\delta Q_{rhh}() = \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_h(\beta, c) \cdot T_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
4 $\delta Q_{rhl}() = \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
5 $\delta Q_{rlh}() = \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_l(\beta, c) \cdot T_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
6 $\delta Q_{rll}() = \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_l(\beta, c) \cdot T_l(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
7 $Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{rhh}() + \delta Q_{rhl}() + \delta Q_{rlh}() + \delta Q_{rll}()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
8 if (r is h)	
9 $V_{RS}(\alpha, c) = V_{RS}(\alpha, c) + \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_l(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
10 else	
11 $V_{TR}(c, \beta) = V_{TR}(c, \beta) + T_h(c, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_l(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
12 $R_r(\alpha, \beta) = R_r(\alpha, \beta) + \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
13 return \mathcal{Z}	
Total update time:	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 3: (left) Counting triangles under a single-tuple update. APPLYUPDATE takes as input an update δR_r to the heavy or light part of R , hence $r \in \{h, l\}$, and the current IVM^ϵ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. It returns a new state that results from applying δR_r to \mathcal{Z} . Lines 3-6 compute the deltas of the affected skew-aware views, and Line 7 maintains Q . Lines 9 and 11 maintain the auxiliary views V_{RS} and V_{TR} , respectively. Line 12 maintains the affected part R_r . (right) The time complexity of computing and applying deltas. The evaluation strategy for computing δQ_{rlh} in Line 5 may choose either S_l or T_h to bound C -values, depending on ϵ . The total time is the maximum of all individual times. The maintenance procedures for S and T are similar.

- (Line 4) Computing δQ_{rhl} requires constant-time lookups in δR_r and V_{ST} .
- (Line 5) Computing δQ_{rlh} can be done in two ways, depending on ϵ : either sum over at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$ C -values in T_h for the given α or sum over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values in S_l for the given β . This delta computation takes at most $\min\{2N^{1-\epsilon}, \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon\}$ constant-time operations, thus $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.
- (Line 6) Computing δQ_{rll} requires summing over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values in S_l for the given β . This delta computation takes $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time.

Maintaining the result of Query (1) using these deltas takes constant time (Line 7). The views V_{RS} and V_{TR} are maintained for updates to distinct parts of R . Maintaining V_{RS} requires iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values in S_l for the given β (Line 9); similarly, maintaining V_{TR} requires iterating over at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$ C -values in T_h for the given α (Line 11). Finally, maintaining the (heavy or light) part of R affected by δR_r takes constant time (Line 12). The total update time is $\mathcal{O}(\max\{1, N^\epsilon, N^{1-\epsilon}, N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}\}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. From the invariant $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follows the claimed time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

3.3 Space Complexity

We next analyze the space complexity of the IVM^ϵ maintenance strategy.

Proposition 10. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the IVM^ϵ state constructed from \mathbf{D} to support the maintenance of the result of Query (1) takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.*

Proof. We consider a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of database \mathbf{D} . N and ϵ take constant space and $|\mathbf{P}| = |\mathbf{D}|$. Figure 2 summarizes the space complexity of the materialized views Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST} , and V_{TR} from \mathbf{V} . The

<hr/> ONUPDATE ($\delta R, \mathcal{Z}$) <hr/> let $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_h, R_l\} \cup \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ if ($\alpha \in \pi_A R_h$ or $\epsilon = 0$) $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATE}(\delta R_h = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ else $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATE}(\delta R_l = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ if ($ \mathbf{D} = N$) $N = 2N$ $\mathcal{Z} = \text{MAJORREBALANCING}(\mathcal{Z})$ else if ($ \mathbf{D} < \lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor$) $N = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}N \rfloor - 1$ $\mathcal{Z} = \text{MAJORREBALANCING}(\mathcal{Z})$ else if ($\alpha \in \pi_A R_l$ and $ \sigma_{A=\alpha} R_l \geq \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$) $\mathcal{Z} = \text{MINORREBALANCING}(R_l, R_h, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z})$ else if ($\alpha \in \pi_A R_h$ and $ \sigma_{A=\alpha} R_h < \frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon$) $\mathcal{Z} = \text{MINORREBALANCING}(R_h, R_l, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z})$ return \mathcal{Z} <hr/>	<hr/> MAJORREBALANCING (\mathcal{Z}) <hr/> let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_h, R_l, S_h, S_l, T_h, T_l\},$ $\{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\})$ $\{R_h, R_l\} = \text{STRICTPARTITION}(R_h, R_l, A, N^\epsilon)$ $\{S_h, S_l\} = \text{STRICTPARTITION}(S_h, S_l, B, N^\epsilon)$ $\{T_h, T_l\} = \text{STRICTPARTITION}(T_h, T_l, C, N^\epsilon)$ $V_{RS}(a, c) = \sum_b R_h(a, b) \cdot S_l(b, c)$ $V_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$ $V_{TR}(c, b) = \sum_a T_h(c, a) \cdot R_l(a, b)$ return \mathcal{Z} <hr/>
	<hr/> MINORREBALANCING ($K_{src}, K_{dst}, X, x, \mathcal{Z}$) <hr/> foreach $\mathbf{t} \in \sigma_{X=x} K_{src}$ do $m = K_{src}(\mathbf{t})$ $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATE}(\delta K_{src} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto -m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATE}(\delta K_{dst} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ return \mathcal{Z} <hr/>

Figure 4: Counting triangles under a single-tuple update with rebalancing. **ONUPDATE** takes as input an update δR and the current IVM^ϵ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} . It returns a new state that results from applying δR to \mathcal{Z} and, if necessary, rebalancing partitions. The condition $\epsilon = 0$ in the third line ensures that all tuples are in R_h when $\epsilon = 0$. **APPLYUPDATE** is given in Figure 3. **MINORREBALANCING**($K_{src}, K_{dst}, X, x, \mathcal{Z}$) moves all tuples with the X -value x from K_{src} to K_{dst} . **MAJORREBALANCING**(\mathcal{Z}) recomputes the relation partitions and views in \mathcal{Z} . **STRICTPARTITION**(K_h, K_l, X, θ) constructs a strict partition of relation K on variable X with threshold θ (see Definition 6). The **ONUPDATE** procedures for updates to relations S and T are analogous.

result of Q takes constant space. As discussed in the proof of Proposition 8, to compute the auxiliary view $V_{RS}(a, c) = \sum_b R_h(a, b) \cdot S_l(b, c)$, we can use either R_h or S_l as the outer relation:

$$|V_{RS}| \leq \min\{ |R_h| \cdot \max_{b \in \pi_B S_l} |\sigma_{B=b} S_l|, |S_l| \cdot \max_{b \in \pi_B R_h} |\sigma_{B=b} R_h| \} < \min\{ N \cdot \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon, N \cdot 2N^{1-\epsilon} \}$$

The size of V_{RS} is thus $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. From $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follows that V_{RS} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space; the space analysis for V_{ST} and V_{TR} is analogous. Overall, the state \mathcal{Z} of \mathbf{D} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space. \square

4 Rebalancing Partitions

The partition of a relation may change after updates. For instance, an insert $\delta R_l = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto 1\}$ may violate the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$ or may violate the light part condition $|\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_l| < \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ and require moving all tuples with the A -value α from R_l to R_h . As the database evolves under updates, IVM^ϵ performs *major* and *minor* rebalancing steps to ensure the size invariant and the conditions for heavy and light parts of each partition always hold. This rebalancing also ensures that the upper bounds on the number of data values, such as the number of B -values paired with α in R_l and the number of distinct A -values in R_h , are valid. The rebalancing cost is amortized over multiple updates.

Major Rebalancing If an update causes the database size to fall below $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor$ or reach N , IVM^ϵ halves or, respectively, doubles N , followed by strictly repartitioning the database with the new threshold N^ϵ and recomputing the materialized views, as shown in Figure 4.

Proposition 11. *Given $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, major rebalancing of an IVM^ϵ state constructed from a database \mathbf{D} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. We consider the major rebalancing procedure from Figure 4. Strictly partitioning the input relations takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. From the proof of Proposition 8 and $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follow that recomputing V_{RS} , V_{ST} , and V_{TR} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time. \square

The (super)linear time of major rebalancing is amortized over $\Omega(N)$ updates. After a major rebalancing step, it holds that $|\mathbf{D}| = \frac{1}{2}N$ (after doubling), or $|\mathbf{D}| = \frac{1}{2}N - \frac{1}{2}$ or $|\mathbf{D}| = \frac{1}{2}N - 1$ (after halving, i.e., setting N to $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}N \rfloor - 1$; the two options are due to the floor functions in the size invariant and halving expression). To violate the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$ and trigger another major rebalancing, the number of required updates is at least $\frac{1}{4}N$. Section 4.1 proves the amortized $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time of major rebalancing.

Minor Rebalancing After each update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, IVM^ϵ checks whether the two conditions $|\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_h| \geq \frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon$ and $|\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_l| < \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ still hold. If the first condition is violated, all tuples in R_h with the A -value α are moved to R_l and the affected views are updated; similarly, if the second condition is violated, all tuples with the A -value α are moved from R_l to R_h , followed by updating the affected views. Figure 4 shows the procedure for minor rebalancing, which deletes affected tuples from one part and inserts them into the other part.

Proposition 12. *Given $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, minor rebalancing of an IVM^ϵ state constructed from a database \mathbf{D} takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. Consider a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$. Minor rebalancing moves fewer than $\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon$ tuples (from heavy to light) or fewer than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon + 1$ tuples (from light to heavy). Each tuple move performs one delete and one insert and costs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ by Proposition 9. Since there are $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ such operations and $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$, the total time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

The (super)linear time of minor rebalancing is amortized over $\Omega(N^\epsilon)$ updates. This lower bound on the number of updates comes from the heavy and light part conditions (cf. Definition 6), namely from the gap between the two thresholds in these conditions. Section 4.1 proves the amortized $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time of minor rebalancing.

Figure 4 gives the trigger procedure `ONUPDATE` that maintains Query (1) under a single-tuple update to relation R and, if necessary, rebalances partitions; the procedures for updates to S and T are analogous. Given an update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and an IVM^ϵ state of a database \mathbf{D} , the procedure first checks in constant time whether the update affects the heavy or light part of R . The update targets R_h if there exists a tuple with the same A -value α already in R_h , or ϵ is set to 0; otherwise, the update targets R_l . When $\epsilon = 0$, all tuples are in R_h , while R_l remains empty. Although this behavior is not required by IVM^ϵ (without the $\epsilon = 0$ condition, R_l would contain only tuples whose A -values have the degree of 1, and R_h would contain all other tuples), it allows us to recover existing IVM approaches, such as classical IVM and factorized IVM, which do not partition relations; by setting ϵ to 0 or 1, IVM^ϵ ensures that all tuples are in R_h or respectively R_l . The procedure `ONUPDATE` then invokes `APPLYUPDATE` from Figure 3. If the update causes a violation of the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$, the procedure invokes `MAJORREBALANCING` to recompute the relation partitions and auxiliary views (note that major rebalancing has no effect on the triangle count). Otherwise, if the heavy or light part condition is violated, `MINORREBALANCING` moves all tuples with the given A -value α from the source part to the destination part of R .

4.1 Proof of Theorem 3

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3 that states the complexity of IVM^ϵ .

Proof. The preprocessing stage constructs the initial IVM^ϵ state from a database \mathbf{D} in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time, as shown in Proposition 8. Materializing the query result ensures constant answer time. The space complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ follows from Proposition 10.

We next analyze the amortized update time complexity. Let $\mathcal{Z}_0 = (\epsilon, N_0, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$ be the initial IVM^ϵ state of a database \mathbf{D}_0 and u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} a sequence of arbitrary single-tuple updates. The application of this update sequence to \mathcal{Z}_0 yields a sequence $\mathcal{Z}_0 \xrightarrow{u_0} \mathcal{Z}_1 \xrightarrow{u_1} \dots \xrightarrow{u_{n-1}} \mathcal{Z}_n$ of IVM^ϵ states, where \mathcal{Z}_{i+1} is the result of executing the procedure $\text{ONUPDATE}(u_i, \mathcal{Z}_i)$ from Figure 4, for $0 \leq i < n$. Let c_i denote the actual execution cost of $\text{ONUPDATE}(u_i, \mathcal{Z}_i)$. For some $\Gamma > 0$, we can decompose each c_i as:

$$c_i = c_i^{\text{apply}} + c_i^{\text{major}} + c_i^{\text{minor}} + \Gamma, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i < n,$$

where c_i^{apply} , c_i^{major} , and c_i^{minor} are the actual costs of the subprocedures APPLYUPDATE , MAJORREBALANCING , and MINORREBALANCING , respectively, in ONUPDATE . If update u_i causes no major rebalancing, then $c_i^{\text{major}} = 0$; similarly, if u_i causes no minor rebalancing, then $c_i^{\text{minor}} = 0$. These actual costs admit the following worst-case upper bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} c_i^{\text{apply}} &\leq \gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(by Proposition 9),} \\ c_i^{\text{major}} &\leq \gamma N_i^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(by Proposition 11), and} \\ c_i^{\text{minor}} &\leq \gamma N_i^{\epsilon+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(by Proposition 12),} \end{aligned}$$

where γ is a constant derived from their asymptotic bounds, and N_i is the threshold base of \mathcal{Z}_i . The actual costs of major and minor rebalancing can be superlinear in the database size.

The crux of this proof is to show that assigning a *sublinear amortized cost* \hat{c}_i to each update u_i accumulates enough budget to pay for such expensive but less frequent rebalancing procedures. For any sequence of n updates, our goal is to show that the accumulated amortized cost is no smaller than the accumulated actual cost:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i. \quad (2)$$

The amortized cost assigned to an update u_i is $\hat{c}_i = \hat{c}_i^{\text{apply}} + \hat{c}_i^{\text{major}} + \hat{c}_i^{\text{minor}} + \Gamma$, where

$$\hat{c}_i^{\text{apply}} = \gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}, \quad \hat{c}_i^{\text{major}} = 4\gamma N_i^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}, \quad \hat{c}_i^{\text{minor}} = 2\gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}, \quad \text{and}$$

Γ and γ are the constants used to upper bound the actual cost of ONUPDATE . In contrast to the actual costs c_i^{major} and c_i^{minor} , the amortized costs \hat{c}_i^{major} and \hat{c}_i^{minor} are always nonzero.

We prove that such amortized costs satisfy Inequality (2). Since $\hat{c}_i^{\text{apply}} \geq c_i^{\text{apply}}$ for $0 \leq i < n$, it suffices to show that the following inequalities hold:

$$\text{(amortizing major rebalancing)} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{\text{major}} \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{\text{major}} \quad \text{and} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{(amortizing minor rebalancing)} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{\text{minor}} \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{\text{minor}}. \quad (4)$$

We prove Inequalities (3) and (4) by induction on the length n of the update sequence.

Major rebalancing.

- *Base case:* We show that Inequality (3) holds for $n = 1$. The preprocessing stage sets $N_0 = 2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}_0| + 1$. If the initial database \mathbf{D}_0 is empty, then $N_0 = 1$ and u_0 triggers major rebalancing (and no minor rebalancing). The amortized cost $\hat{c}_0^{major} = 4\gamma N_0^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} = 4\gamma$ suffices to cover the actual cost $c_0^{major} \leq \gamma N_0^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} = \gamma$. If the initial database is nonempty, u_0 cannot trigger major rebalancing (i.e., violate the size invariant) because $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N_0 \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{D}_0| \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}_0| - 1$ (lower threshold) and $|\mathbf{D}_0| + 1 < N_0 = 2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}_0| + 1$ (upper threshold); then, $\hat{c}_0^{major} \geq c_0^{major} = 0$. Thus, Inequality (3) holds for $n = 1$.
- *Inductive step:* Assumed that Inequality (3) holds for all update sequences of length up to $n - 1$, we show it holds for update sequences of length n . If update u_{n-1} causes no major rebalancing, then $\hat{c}_{n-1}^{major} = 4\gamma N_{n-1}^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} \geq 0$ and $c_{n-1}^{major} = 0$, thus Inequality (3) holds for n . Otherwise, if applying u_{n-1} violates the size invariant, the database size $|\mathbf{D}_n|$ is either $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N_{n-1} \rfloor - 1$ or N_{n-1} . Let \mathcal{Z}_j be the state created after the previous major rebalancing or, if there is no such step, the initial state. For the former ($j > 0$), the major rebalancing step ensures $|\mathbf{D}_j| = \frac{1}{2}N_j$ after doubling and $|\mathbf{D}_j| = \frac{1}{2}N_j - \frac{1}{2}$ or $|\mathbf{D}_j| = \frac{1}{2}N_j - 1$ after halving the threshold base N_j ; for the latter ($j = 0$), the preprocessing stage ensures $|\mathbf{D}_j| = \frac{1}{2}N_j - \frac{1}{2}$. The threshold base N_j changes only with major rebalancing, thus $N_j = N_{j+1} = \dots = N_{n-1}$. The number of updates needed to change the database size from $|\mathbf{D}_j|$ to $|\mathbf{D}_n|$ (i.e., between two major rebalancing) is at least $\frac{1}{4}N_{n-1}$ since $\min\{\frac{1}{2}N_j - 1 - (\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N_{n-1} \rfloor - 1), N_{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}N_j\} \geq \frac{1}{4}N_{n-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{major} &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{major} + \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{major} && \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{major} + \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} 4\gamma N_{n-1}^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && (N_j = \dots = N_{n-1}) \\
&\geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{major} + \frac{1}{4}N_{n-1} 4\gamma N_{n-1}^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(at least } \frac{1}{4}N_{n-1} \text{ updates)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{major} + \gamma N_{n-1}^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} \\
&\geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{major} + c_{n-1}^{major} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{major} && (c_j^{major} = \dots = c_{n-2}^{major} = 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Inequality (3) holds for update sequences of length n .

Minor rebalancing. When the degree of a value in a partition changes such that the heavy or light part condition no longer holds, minor rebalancing moves the affected tuples between the heavy and light parts of the partition. To prove Inequality (4), we decompose the cost of minor rebalancing per relation and data value of its partitioning variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
c_i^{minor} &= \sum_{a \in \text{Dom}(A)} c_i^{R,a} + \sum_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} c_i^{S,b} + \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} c_i^{T,c} \quad \text{and} \\
\hat{c}_i^{minor} &= \sum_{a \in \text{Dom}(A)} \hat{c}_i^{R,a} + \sum_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} \hat{c}_i^{S,b} + \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} \hat{c}_i^{T,c}
\end{aligned}$$

We write $c_i^{R,a}$ and $\hat{c}_i^{R,a}$ to denote the actual and respectively amortized costs of minor rebalancing caused by update u_i , for relation R and an A -value a . If update u_i is of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and causes

minor rebalancing, then $c_i^{R,\alpha} = c_i^{minor}$; otherwise, $c_i^{R,\alpha} = 0$. If update u_i is of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, then $\hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} = \hat{c}_i^{minor}$ regardless of whether u_i causes minor rebalancing or not; otherwise, $\hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} = 0$. The actual costs $c_i^{S,b}$ and $c_i^{T,c}$ and the amortized costs $\hat{c}_i^{S,b}$ and $\hat{c}_i^{T,c}$ are defined similarly.

We prove that for the partition of R and any $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(A)$ the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{R,\alpha}. \quad (5)$$

Due to the symmetry of the triangle query, Inequality (4) follows directly from Inequality (5).

We prove Inequality (5) for an arbitrary $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(A)$ by induction on the length n of the update sequence.

- *Base case:* We show that Inequality (5) holds for $n = 1$. Assume that update u_0 is of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$; otherwise, $\hat{c}_0^{R,\alpha} = c_0^{R,\alpha} = 0$, and Inequality (5) follows trivially for $n = 1$. If the initial database is empty, u_0 triggers major rebalancing but no minor rebalancing, thus $\hat{c}_0^{R,\alpha} = 2\gamma N_0^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} \geq c_0^{R,\alpha} = 0$. If the initial database is nonempty, each relation is partitioned using the threshold N_0^ϵ . For update u_0 to trigger minor rebalancing, the degree of the A -value α in R_h or R_l has to either decrease from $\lceil N_0^\epsilon \rceil$ to $\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_0^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ (heavy to light) or increase from $\lceil N_0^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ to $\lceil \frac{3}{2}N_0^\epsilon \rceil$ (light to heavy). The former happens only if $\lceil N_0^\epsilon \rceil = 1$ and update u_0 removes the last tuple with the A -value α from R_h , thus no minor rebalancing is needed; the latter cannot happen since update u_0 can increase $|\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_l|$ to at most $\lceil N_0^\epsilon \rceil$, and $\lceil N_0^\epsilon \rceil < \lceil \frac{3}{2}N_0^\epsilon \rceil$. In any case, $\hat{c}_0^{R,\alpha} \geq c_0^{R,\alpha}$, which implies that Inequality (5) holds for $n = 1$.
- *Inductive step:* Assumed that Inequality (5) holds for all update sequences of length up to $n-1$, we show it holds for update sequences of length n . Consider that update u_{n-1} is of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and causes minor rebalancing; otherwise, $\hat{c}_{n-1}^{R,\alpha} \geq 0$ and $c_{n-1}^{R,\alpha} = 0$, and Inequality (5) follows trivially for n . Let \mathcal{Z}_j be the state created after the previous major rebalancing or, if there is no such step, the initial state. The threshold changes only with major rebalancing, thus $N_j = N_{j+1} = \dots = N_{n-1}$. Depending on whether there exist minor rebalancing steps since state \mathcal{Z}_j , we distinguish two cases:

Case 1: There is no minor rebalancing caused by an update of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta') \mapsto m'\}$ since state \mathcal{Z}_j ; thus, $c_j^{R,\alpha} = \dots = c_{n-2}^{R,\alpha} = 0$. From state \mathcal{Z}_j to state \mathcal{Z}_n , the number of tuples with the A -value α either decreases from at least $\lceil N_j^\epsilon \rceil$ to $\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ (heavy to light) or increases from at most $\lceil N_j^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ to $\lceil \frac{3}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil$ (light to heavy). For this change to happen, the number of updates needs to be greater than $\frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon$ since $N_j = N_{n-1}$ and $\min\{\lceil N_j^\epsilon \rceil - (\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - 1), \lceil \frac{3}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - (\lceil N_j^\epsilon \rceil - 1)\} > \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} && \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} 2\gamma N_{n-1}^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && (N_j = \dots = N_{n-1}) \\ &> \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon 2\gamma N_{n-1}^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(more than } \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \text{ updates)} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + c_{n-1}^{R,\alpha} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} && (c_j^{R,\alpha} = \dots = c_{n-2}^{R,\alpha} = 0). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: There is at least one minor rebalancing step caused by an update of the form $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta') \mapsto m'\}$ since state \mathcal{Z}_j . Let \mathcal{Z}_ℓ denote the state created after the previous minor rebalancing caused by an update of this form; thus, $c_\ell^{R,\alpha} = \dots = c_{n-2}^{R,\alpha} = 0$. The minor rebalancing steps creating \mathcal{Z}_ℓ and \mathcal{Z}_n move tuples with the A -value α between R_h and R_l in opposite directions. From state \mathcal{Z}_ℓ to state \mathcal{Z}_n , the number of such tuples either decreases from $\lceil \frac{3}{2}N_\ell^\epsilon \rceil$ to $\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ (heavy to light) or increases from $\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_\ell^\epsilon \rceil - 1$ to $\lceil \frac{3}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil$ (light to heavy). For this change to happen, the number of updates needs to be greater than N_{n-1}^ϵ since $N_l = N_{n-1}$ and $\min\{\lceil \frac{3}{2}N_\ell^\epsilon \rceil - (\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - 1), \lceil \frac{3}{2}N_{n-1}^\epsilon \rceil - (\lceil \frac{1}{2}N_\ell^\epsilon \rceil - 1)\} > N_{n-1}^\epsilon$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + \sum_{i=\ell}^{n-1} \hat{c}_i^{R,\alpha} && \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + \sum_{i=\ell}^{n-1} 2\gamma N_{n-1}^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && (N_j = \dots = N_{n-1}) \\
&> \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + N_{n-1}^\epsilon 2\gamma N_{n-1}^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} && \text{(more than } N_{n-1}^\epsilon \text{ updates)} \\
&> \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} + c_{n-1}^{R,\alpha} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i^{R,\alpha} && (c_\ell^{R,\alpha} = \dots = c_{n-2}^{R,\alpha} = 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Cases 1 and 2 imply that Inequality (5) holds for update sequences of length n .

This shows that Inequality (2) holds when the amortized cost of $\text{ONUPDATE}(u_i, \mathcal{Z}_i)$ is

$$\hat{c}_i = \gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} + 4\gamma N_i^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} + 2\gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}} + \Gamma, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i < n,$$

where Γ and γ are constants. The amortized cost \hat{c}_i^{major} of major rebalancing is $4\gamma N_i^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}$, and the amortized cost \hat{c}_i^{minor} of minor rebalancing is $2\gamma N_i^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}$. From the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N_i \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}_i| < N_i$ follows that $|\mathbf{D}_i| < N_i < 4(|\mathbf{D}_i| + 1)$ for $0 \leq i < n$, where $|\mathbf{D}_i|$ is the database size before update u_i . This implies that for any database \mathbf{D} , the amortized major rebalancing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, the amortized minor rebalancing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, and the overall amortized update time of IVM^ϵ is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

Given $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ maintains the triangle count query in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time while using $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space. It thus defines a tradeoff between time and space parameterized by ϵ , as shown in Figure 1. IVM^ϵ achieves the optimal amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ at $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, for which the space is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper introduces IVM^ϵ , an incremental maintenance approach to counting triangles under updates that exhibits a space-time tradeoff such that the space-time product is quadratic in the size of the database. IVM^ϵ can trade space for update time. The amortized update time can be as low as the square root of the database size, which is worst-case optimal conditioned on the Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication (OMv) conjecture. The space requirements of IVM^ϵ can be improved to linear while keeping the amortized update time optimal by using a refined partitioning that takes into account the degrees of data values for both variables (instead of one variable only) in each relation (Appendix D). IVM^ϵ captures classical and factorized IVM as special cases with suboptimal, linear update time (Appendix A).

There are worst-case optimal algorithms for *join* queries in the *static* setting [19]. In contrast, IVM^ϵ is worst-case optimal for the *count* aggregate over the triangle join query in the *dynamic* setting. The latter

setting poses challenges beyond the former. First, the optimality argument for static join algorithms follows from their runtime being linear (ithmic) in their output size; this argument does not apply to our triangle count query, since its output is a scalar and hence of constant size. Second, optimality in the dynamic setting requires a more fine-grained argument that exploits the skew in the data for different evaluation strategies, view materialization, and delta computation; in contrast, there are static worst-case optimal join algorithms that do not need to exploit skew, materialize views, nor delta computation.

This paper opens up a line of work on *dynamic worst-case optimal query evaluation algorithms*. The goal is a complete characterization of the complexity of incremental maintenance for arbitrary functional aggregate queries over various rings [1]. Different rings can be used as the domain of tuple multiplicities (or payloads). We used here the ring $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ of integers to support counting. The relational data ring supports payloads with listing and factorized representations of relations, and the degree- m matrix ring supports payloads with gradients used for learning linear regression models [21].

Towards the aforementioned goal, we would first like to find a syntactical characterization of all queries that admit incremental maintenance in (amortized) sublinear time. Using known (first-order, fully recursive, or factorized) incremental maintenance techniques, cyclic and even acyclic joins require at least linear update time. Our intuition is that this characterization is given by a notion of diameter of the query hypergraph. This class strictly contains the q -hierarchical queries, which admit constant-time updates [5].

Minor variants of IVM^ϵ can be used to maintain the counting versions of any query built using three relations (Appendix H), the 4-path query (Appendix G), and the Loomis-Whitney queries (Appendix F) in worst-case optimal time. The same conditional lower bound on the update time shown for the triangle count applies for most of the mentioned queries, too. This leads to the striking realization that, while in the static setting the counting versions of the cyclic query computing triangles and the acyclic query computing paths of length 3 have different complexities, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$, and pose distinct computational challenges, they share the same complexity and can use a very similar approach in the dynamic setting. A further IVM^ϵ variant allows the constant-delay enumeration of all triangles after each update, while preserving the same optimal amortized update time as for counting triangles (Appendix E). These variants exploit the fact that our amortization technique is agnostic to the query to maintain and the update mechanism. It relies on two prerequisites. First, rebalancing is performed by moving tuples between relation parts. Second, the number of moved tuples per rebalancing is asymptotically no more than the number of updates performed since the previous rebalancing.

References

- [1] M. Abo Khamis, H. Q. Ngo, and A. Rudra. FAQ: Questions Asked Frequently. In *PODS*, pages 13–28, 2016.
- [2] N. Alon, R. Yuster, and U. Zwick. Finding and Counting Given Length Cycles. *Algorithmica*, 17(3):209–223, 1997.
- [3] Z. Bar-Yossef, R. Kumar, and D. Sivakumar. Reductions in Streaming Algorithms, with an Application to Counting Triangles in Graphs. In *SODA*, pages 623–632, 2002.
- [4] C. Beeri, R. Fagin, D. Maier, and M. Yannakakis. On the Desirability of Acyclic Database Schemes. *J. ACM*, 30(3):479–513, 1983.
- [5] C. Berkholz, J. Keppeler, and N. Schweikardt. Answering Conjunctive Queries Under Updates. In *PODS*, pages 303–318, 2017.
- [6] C. Berkholz, J. Keppeler, and N. Schweikardt. Answering UCQs Under Updates and in the Presence of Integrity Constraints. In *ICDT*, pages 8:1–8:19, 2018.
- [7] L. S. Buriol, G. Frahling, S. Leonardi, A. Marchetti-Spaccamela, and C. Sohler. Counting Triangles in Data Streams. In *PODS*, pages 253–262, 2006.

- [8] R. Chirkova and J. Yang. Materialized Views. *Found. & Trends DB*, 4(4):295–405, 2012.
- [9] G. Cormode and H. Jowhari. A Second Look at Counting Triangles in Graph Streams (Corrected). *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 683:22–30, 2017.
- [10] N. N. Dalvi and D. Suciu. The Dichotomy of Conjunctive Queries on Probabilistic Structures. In *PODS*, pages 293–302, 2007.
- [11] T. Eden, A. Levi, D. Ron, and C. Seshadhri. Approximately Counting Triangles in Sublinear Time. In *FOCS*, pages 614–633, 2015.
- [12] M. Grohe and D. Marx. Constraint Solving via Fractional Edge Covers. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 11(1):4:1–4:20, 2014.
- [13] M. Henzinger, S. Krinninger, D. Nanongkai, and T. Saranurak. Unifying and Strengthening Hardness for Dynamic Problems via the Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication Conjecture. In *STOC*, pages 21–30, 2015.
- [14] M. Idris, M. Ugarte, and S. Vansummeren. The Dynamic Yannakakis Algorithm: Compact and Efficient Query Processing Under Updates. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1259–1274, 2017.
- [15] H. Jowhari and M. Ghodsi. New Streaming Algorithms for Counting Triangles in Graphs. In *COCOON*, pages 710–716, 2005.
- [16] C. Koch, Y. Ahmad, O. Kennedy, M. Nikolic, A. Nötzli, D. Lupei, and A. Shaikhha. DBToaster: Higher-Order Delta Processing for Dynamic, Frequently Fresh Views. *VLDB J.*, 23(2):253–278, 2014.
- [17] P. Koutris, S. Salihoglu, and D. Suciu. Algorithmic Aspects of Parallel Data Processing. *Found. & Trends DB*, 8(4):239–370, 2018.
- [18] A. McGregor, S. Vorotnikova, and H. T. Vu. Better Algorithms for Counting Triangles in Data Streams. In *PODS*, pages 401–411, 2016.
- [19] H. Q. Ngo. Worst-Case Optimal Join Algorithms: Techniques, Results, and Open Problems. In *PODS*, pages 111–124, 2018.
- [20] H. Q. Ngo, C. Ré, and A. Rudra. Skew Strikes Back: New Developments in the Theory of Join Algorithms. *SIGMOD Record*, 42(4):5–16, 2013.
- [21] M. Nikolic and D. Olteanu. Incremental View Maintenance with Triple Lock Factorization Benefits. In *SIGMOD*, pages 365–380, 2018.
- [22] T. Schwentick and T. Zeume. Dynamic Complexity: Recent Updates. *SIGLOG News*, 3(2):30–52, 2016.
- [23] V. V. Williams. On Some Fine-Grained Questions in Algorithms and Complexity. In *ICM*, volume 3, pages 3431–3472, 2018.
- [24] T. Zeume. The Dynamic Descriptive Complexity of k-Clique. *Inf. Comput.*, 256:9–22, 2017.

A Recovering Existing Dynamic and Static Approaches

In sections A.1 and A.2 we show how IVM^c recovers the classical first order IVM [8] and the factorized IVM [21] for maintaining the triangle count. Section A.3 describes how IVM^c counts all triangles in a static database in the worst-case optimal time to list them [20].

We assume that $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$ is the input database.

A.1 The Classical First-Order IVM

The classical first order IVM materializes only the input relations and the result of Query (1). Given a single-tuple update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to relation R , it maintains Query (1) under δR by computing the delta query $\delta Q() = \delta R(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S(\beta, c) \cdot T(c, \alpha)$ and setting $Q() = Q() + \delta Q()$. The delta computation needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time, since it requires the iteration over possibly linearly many C -values paired with β in S and with α in T . The evaluation of updates to the relations S and T is analogous.

To recover the classical IVM by IVM^ϵ , we choose $\epsilon = 0$ or $\epsilon = 1$. In the former case, all tuples stay in the heavy relation parts, and in the latter case, they stay in the light relation parts. In both cases, the auxiliary views stay empty, since each of them uses one light and one heavy relation part. Likewise, almost all skew-aware views stay empty as well. The only possibly nonempty skew-aware view returns the full triangle count. We explain both cases in more detail.

We first consider the case $\epsilon = 1$. The preprocessing stage sets the threshold base N_0 of the initial state \mathcal{Z}_0 to $2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}| + 1$ and strictly partitions each relation with threshold $N_0^\epsilon = N_0$. Since, $|\sigma_{A=a}R| < N_0$ for all A -values a , all tuples in R end up in the light part of R . Similarly, all tuples in S or T are assigned to the light parts of their relations. Consequently, all auxiliary views in \mathcal{Z}_0 are empty, since each of them refers to at least one heavy relation part. The only possibly nonempty skew-aware view is $\delta Q_{lll}()$, which returns the full triangle count. Given an initial update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, the procedure ONUPDATE in Figure 4 invokes APPLYUPDATE from Figure 3 for the light part of R , since $\alpha \notin \pi_A R_h$ and $\epsilon \neq 0$. The degree of α in R_l cannot reach $\frac{3}{2}N_0^\epsilon$ as a result of the update, hence, ONUPDATE does not invoke minor rebalancing. The procedure MAJORREBALANCING , which might be invoked by ONUPDATE , does not move tuples to the heavy relation parts, since the partition threshold is always greater than the database size. Similarly, all subsequent updates are propagated to the light relation parts and do not trigger movements between relation parts. This means that the materialized auxiliary views V_{RS} , V_{ST} , and V_{TR} as well as all skew-aware views referring to heavy relation parts stay empty. The only materialized view maintained by APPLYUPDATE is the triangle count Q . Hence, the space complexity is dominated by the size of the input relations and is therefore linear like for the classical IVM. Given any update $\delta R_l = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, APPLYUPDATE computes the delta $\delta Q_{lll}() = \delta R_l(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_l(\beta, c) \cdot T_l(c, \alpha)$ and sets $Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{lll}()$. Following the proof of Proposition 9, this delta computation requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. Together with the linear time needed for major rebalancing, the overall worst-case update time is linear.

The case for $\epsilon = 0$ is analogous. All tuples stay in the heavy relation parts, and the light parts are kept empty. This means that all auxiliary views V_{RS} , V_{ST} , and V_{TR} as well as all skew-aware views besides Q_{hhh} stay empty. Hence, the space complexity is linear. Given an update $\delta R_h = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$, the procedure APPLYUPDATE maintains the result of Q by computing the delta $\delta Q_{hhh}() = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_h(\beta, c) \cdot T_h(c, \alpha)$ and setting $\delta Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{hhh}()$. Due to the proof of Proposition 9, this delta computation requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\epsilon}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time in the worst case.

A.2 The Factorized IVM

The factorized IVM materializes besides the input relations and the result of Query (1), an additional view to speed up updates to one relation. Here we choose this relation to be R ; the cases for S and T are analogous. The materialized view is $\hat{V}_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S(b, c) \cdot T(c, a)$, which is of size $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^2)$. Updates $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to relation R can be processed by computing $\delta Q() = \delta R(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$ and setting $Q() = Q() + \delta Q()$ in overall constant time. Updates to relations S and T , however, affect not only Q , but also V_{ST} . Given an update $\delta S = \{(\beta, \gamma) \mapsto m\}$, the factorized IVM maintains Q by computing the delta $\delta Q() = \delta S(\beta, \gamma) \cdot \sum_a R(a, \beta) \cdot T(\gamma, a)$ and setting $Q() = Q() + \delta Q$. The view V_{ST} is maintained by computing $V_{ST}(\beta, a) = \delta S(\beta, \gamma) \cdot T(\gamma, a)$. Both computations need $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time, as they require the iteration over possibly linearly many A -values. Updates to T are handled analogously.

To recover factorized IVM, we use a different parameter ϵ_K for each relation K : $\epsilon_R \in \{0, 1\}$, $\epsilon_S = 0$, and $\epsilon_T = 1$. This means that in each IVM^ϵ state with threshold base N , relations R , S , and T are partitioned with thresholds N^{ϵ_R} , N^{ϵ_S} , and N^{ϵ_T} , respectively. We consider the setting $\epsilon_R = \epsilon_S = 0$ and $\epsilon_T = 1$. The other setting $\epsilon_R = \epsilon_T = 1$ and $\epsilon_S = 0$ is analogous. Similar to the case of recovering the

classical IVM in Section A.1, the relations R and S are completely included in their heavy parts and T is contained in its light part. The only possibly nonempty auxiliary and skew-aware views are $V_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$ and δQ_{hhl} . Following the space analysis in the proof of Proposition 10, the view V_{ST} is of size $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon_T, 1-\epsilon_S\}}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^2)$. Query Q is maintained under updates $\delta R_h = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ by computing the delta $\delta Q_{hhl}() = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$ and setting $Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{hhl}()$ in constant time. Updates to S and T affect besides Query Q , the view V_{ST} . Let $\delta S_h = \{(\beta, \gamma) \mapsto m\}$ be an update to S_h . IVM $^\epsilon$ maintains Q and V_{ST} under δS_h by computing:

- $\delta Q_{hhl}() = \delta S_h(\beta, \gamma) \cdot \sum_a R_h(a, \beta) \cdot T_l(\gamma, a)$, $Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{hhl}()$, and
- $V_{ST}(\beta, a) = V_{ST}(\beta, a) + \delta S_h(\beta, \gamma) \cdot T_l(\gamma, a)$.

According to the analysis in the proof of Proposition 9, the computation in the first line requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{\epsilon_T, 1-\epsilon_R\}})$ time and the second line needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon_T})$ time. Since $\epsilon_R = 0$ and $\epsilon_T = 1$, the computation time amounts to $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$. In case of an update $\delta T_l = \{(\gamma, \alpha) \mapsto m\}$, IVM $^\epsilon$ perform the following computations:

- $\delta Q_{hhl}() = \delta T_l(\gamma, \alpha) \cdot \sum_b R_h(\alpha, b) \cdot S_h(b, \gamma)$, $Q() = Q() + \delta Q_{hhl}()$, and
- $V_{ST}(b, \alpha) = V_{ST}(b, \alpha) + \delta T_l(\gamma, \alpha) \cdot S_h(b, \gamma)$.

Following the proof of Proposition 9, both lines need $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\epsilon_S})$ time. As $\epsilon_S = 0$, the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$.

A.3 Counting Triangles in Static Databases

All triangles in the database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$ can be counted by computing the join of R , S , and T using a worst-case optimal algorithm and summing up the multiplicities of the result tuples in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ [20]. IVM $^\epsilon$ allows to recover this computation time for counting triangles in the static case. We fix $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and insert all tuples from \mathbf{D} , one at a time, into a database \mathbf{D}' with initially empty relations. The preprocessing time is constant. By Theorem 3, IVM $^\epsilon$ guarantees $\mathcal{O}(M^{\frac{1}{2}})$ amortized update time, where M is the size of \mathbf{D}' at update time. Thus, the total time to count the triangles in \mathbf{D} is $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{M=0}^{|\mathbf{D}|-1} M^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}| \cdot |\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$.

To avoid rebalancing, we can preprocess the input relations in \mathbf{D} to decide for each tuple its ultimate relation part. More precisely, each tuple (a, b) from R with $|\sigma_{A=a}R| \geq |\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is inserted to the heavy part of R while all other tuples from R are inserted to the light part. The distribution of the tuples from S and T is analogous. Since we do not perform any rebalancing, by Proposition 9, the worst-case (and not only amortized) time of each insert is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$.

B Counting Triangles with Self-Joins

IVM $^\epsilon$ also applies to the triangle count query with self-joins over one relation. This query models the common case of counting triangles in a graph given by its edge relation R .

$$Q() = \sum_{a,b,c} R(a, b) \cdot R(b, c) \cdot R(c, a)$$

A trivial way to maintain Q is to create three distinct copies of R and treat each update to R as a sequence of three updates to its copies. The asymptotic time and space complexities remain unchanged (see Theorem 3). Alternatively, we can maintain only R and apply the delta rules from Section 2 on the self-joins in Q . We describe this latter approach next.

We partition the relation R with threshold N^ϵ for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ into R_h and R_l . The query Q is the sum of all the partial counts: $Q() = \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_u(a, b) \cdot R_v(b, c) \cdot R_w(c, a)$. Now, consider an

update $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to R , where r is fixed to either h or l . For simplicity, we omit the function arguments in what follows. The delta query δQ is:

$$\delta Q = \delta \left(\sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w \right) = \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta(R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w)$$

We simplify the analysis using algebraic transformations. From the delta rules, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta(R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w) \\ &= (\delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w) + (R_u \cdot \delta(R_v \cdot R_w)) + (\delta R_u \cdot \delta(R_v \cdot R_w)) \\ &= (\delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w) + (R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot R_w) + (R_u \cdot R_v \cdot \delta R_w) + (R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot \delta R_w) + \\ & \quad (\delta R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot R_w) + (\delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot \delta R_w) + (\delta R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot \delta R_w) \end{aligned}$$

Since the query Q is symmetric, we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w &= \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot R_w = \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_u \cdot R_v \cdot \delta R_w \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot R_w &= \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot \delta R_w = \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot \delta R_w \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{3}$ be a relation mapping the empty tuple to multiplicity 3, that is, $\mathbf{3} = \{() \mapsto 3\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta Q &= \mathbf{3} \cdot \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot R_v \cdot R_w + \\ & \quad \mathbf{3} \cdot \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot R_w + \sum_{u,v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_{a,b,c} \delta R_u \cdot \delta R_v \cdot \delta R_w \end{aligned}$$

We can further simplify δQ because each δR_u with $u \neq r$ evaluates to the empty relation.

$$\delta Q = \mathbf{3} \cdot \sum_{v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_c \delta R_r \cdot R_v \cdot R_w + \mathbf{3} \cdot \sum_{w \in \{h,l\}} \delta R_r \cdot \delta R_r \cdot R_w + \delta R_r \cdot \delta R_r \cdot \delta R_r$$

The last two summands having multiple occurrences of δR_r yield non-empty relations only when $\alpha = \beta$, that is, when $\delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha)$ (or $\delta R_r(\beta, \beta)$) returns a nonzero multiplicity. Thus, we can write the delta query as:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta Q() &= \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_{v,w \in \{h,l\}} \sum_c R_v(\beta, c) \cdot R_w(c, \alpha) + \\ & \quad \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \sum_{w \in \{h,l\}} R_w(\alpha, \alpha) + \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Figure 5 shows the procedure for maintaining the result of the triangle count query with self-joins under an update $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$. Lines 3 – 6 compute the first summand of δQ similarly as in the self-join free case except that now each delta count is multiplied by 3. As before, we materialize an auxiliary view $V(a, c) = \sum_b R_h(a, b) \cdot R_l(b, c)$ to achieve sublinear delta computation for Q .

Whereas for maintaining the result of the triangle count query without self-joins IVM^ϵ materializes three distinct views (see Figure 2), here these three views are equivalent; thus, only V is needed. In the remaining two summands of δQ , δR_r binds all three variables A, B, C such that the count results are nonzero if $\alpha = \beta$. Lines 7 – 9 compute these two summands in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Overall, the complexity of maintaining the result of the triangle count query with self-joins under a single-tuple update is the same as that without self-joins: $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time and $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space. The amortized analysis is also similar.

C Worst-Case Optimality of IVM^ϵ

In this section, we prove Proposition 4 that states a lower bound on the incremental maintenance of the triangle count, conditioned on the OMv conjecture (Conjecture 2). The proof is inspired by recent work [5]. It relies on the Online Vector-Matrix-Vector Multiplication (OuMv) conjecture, which is implied by the OMv conjecture. We introduce the OuMv problem and state the corresponding conjecture.

APPLYUPDATESELFJOIN($\delta R_r, \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_l, R_h\}, \{Q, V\})$	
3 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c R_h(\beta, c) \cdot R_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
4 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V(\beta, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
5 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c R_l(\beta, c) \cdot R_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
6 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c R_l(\beta, c) \cdot R_l(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D}^\epsilon)$
7 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot R_h(\alpha, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
8 $Q() = Q() + \mathbf{3} \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot R_l(\alpha, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
9 $Q() = Q() + \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha) \cdot \delta R_r(\alpha, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
10 if (r is h)	
11 $V(\alpha, c) = V(\alpha, c) + \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot R_l(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D}^\epsilon)$
12 else	
13 $V(a, \beta) = V(a, \beta) + R_h(a, \beta) \cdot \delta R_l(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D}^{1-\epsilon})$
14 $R_r(\alpha, \beta) = R_r(\alpha, \beta) + \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
15 return \mathcal{Z}	
Total update time:	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 5: (left) Counting triangles over a self-join under a single-tuple update. APPLYUPDATESELFJOIN takes as input an update δR_r to the heavy or light part of R , hence $r \in \{h, l\}$, and the current IVM $^\epsilon$ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. It returns a new state that arises from applying δR_r to \mathcal{Z} . Notation: $\mathbf{3} = \{() \mapsto 3\}$. Lines 7-9 compute non-empty deltas only when $\alpha = \beta$. (right) The time complexity of computing and applying deltas.

Definition 13 (Online Vector-Matrix-Vector Multiplication (OuMv) [13]). *We are given an $n \times n$ Boolean matrix \mathbf{M} and receive n pairs of Boolean column-vectors of size n , denoted by $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n)$; after seeing each pair $(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)$, we output the product $\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}_i$ before we see the next pair.*

Conjecture 14 (OuMv Conjecture, Theorem 2.7 in [13]). *For any $\gamma > 0$, there is no algorithm that solves OuMv in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-\gamma})$.*

C.1 Reduction from the OuMv Problem

The following proof of Proposition 4 reduces the OuMv problem to the problem of incrementally maintaining the triangle count. This reduction implies that if there is an algorithm that incrementally maintains the triangle count under single-tuple updates with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ enumeration delay for some $\gamma > 0$ and database \mathbf{D} , then the OuMv problem can be solved in subcubic time. This contradicts the OuMv conjecture and, consequently, the OMv conjecture.

Proof of Proposition 4. (inspired by [5]) For the sake of contradiction, assume that there is an incremental maintenance algorithm \mathcal{A} with arbitrary preprocessing time, amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$, and answer time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ that counts triangles under single-tuple updates. We show that this algorithm can be used to design an algorithm \mathcal{B} that solves the OuMv problem in subcubic time, which contradicts the OuMv conjecture.

Figure 6 gives the pseudocode of \mathcal{B} processing an OuMv input $(\mathbf{M}, (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n))$. We denote the entry of \mathbf{M} in row i and column j by $\mathbf{M}(i, j)$ and the i -th component of \mathbf{v} by $\mathbf{v}(i)$. The algorithm first constructs the initial state \mathcal{Z} from an empty database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$. Then, it executes at most n^2

SOLVEOUMV($\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n$)

initial database state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, 1, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$

foreach $(i, j) \in \mathbf{M}$ **do**

$\delta S = \{(i, j) \mapsto \mathbf{M}(i, j)\}$

ONUPDATE($\delta S, \mathcal{Z}$)

foreach $r = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

foreach $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

$\delta R = \{(a, i) \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_r(i) - R(a, i))\}$

ONUPDATE($\delta R, \mathcal{Z}$)

$\delta T = \{(i, a) \mapsto (\mathbf{v}_r(i) - T(i, a))\}$

ONUPDATE($\delta T, \mathcal{Z}$)

output $(Q() \neq 0)$

Figure 6: The procedure SOLVEOUMV solves the OuMv problem using an incremental maintenance algorithm that counts triangles under single-tuple updates. The state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, 1, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$ is the initial IVM $^\epsilon$ state of a database with empty relations R , S and T . The procedure ONUPDATE maintains the triangle count query under single-tuple updates as given in Figure 4.

updates to the relation S such that $S = \{(i, j) \mapsto \mathbf{M}(i, j) \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. In each round $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the algorithm executes at most $2n$ updates to the relations R and T such that $R = \{(a, i) \mapsto \mathbf{u}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ and $T = \{(i, a) \mapsto \mathbf{v}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$, where a is some constant. By construction, $\mathbf{u}_r^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}_r = 1$ if and only if there exist $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_r(i) = 1$, $\mathbf{M}(i, j) = 1$, and $\mathbf{v}_r(j) = 1$, which is equivalent to $R(a, i) \cdot S(i, j) \cdot T(j, a) = 1$. Thus, the algorithm outputs 1 at the end of round r if and only if the triangle count is nonzero.

Constructing the initial state from an empty database takes constant time. The construction of relation S from \mathbf{M} requires at most n^2 updates. Given that the amortized time for each update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ and the database size $|\mathbf{D}|$ is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, the overall time for this phase is $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \cdot n^{1-2\gamma}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$. In each round, the algorithm performs at most $2n$ updates and outputs the result in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ time. The overall execution time is $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-2\gamma})$ per round and $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$ for n rounds. Thus, algorithm \mathcal{B} needs $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$ time to solve the OuMv problem, which contradicts the OuMv conjecture and, consequently, the OMv conjecture. \square

Theorem 3 and Proposition 4 imply that for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, IVM $^\epsilon$ incrementally maintains the count of triangles under single-tuple updates to a database \mathbf{D} with optimal amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and constant answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails (Corollary 5).

Note that the proof of Proposition 4 can easily be turned into a lower bound proof for maintaining the result of any triangle query with free variables. In the reduction described in the proof of Proposition 4, we output 1 at the end of a round if and only if the triangle count is nonzero. To turn the proof into lower bound proof for the maintenance of any triangle query with free variables, we can use the same encoding for the matrix \mathbf{M} and the vectors and ask at the end of each round whether the query result contains at least one tuple. This reduction gives us a conditional lower bound on the update time and enumeration delay for triangle queries with free variables:

Corollary 15 (Proof of Proposition 4). *For any $\gamma > 0$ and database \mathbf{D} , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains the result of any triangle query with free variables under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ enumeration delay, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*




Figure 7: The space and amortized update time parameterized by ϵ of IVM^ϵ with refined partitions.

D Improving Space by Refining Relation Partitions

The IVM^ϵ algorithm for maintaining the result of the triangle count, as presented in Sections 3 and 4, partitions each relation on its first variable and achieves a space-time tradeoff such that the space-time product is quadratic. This tradeoff is visualized in Figure 1. In this section, we design a variant of this algorithm that achieves better space complexity by using more refined relation partitions. The partitioning takes the degrees of data values of both variables for each relation into account. While the preprocessing time, amortized update time, and answer time stay as before, the space complexity becomes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$. Figure 7 shows the obtained amortized update time and space complexity parameterized by $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. For $\epsilon = 0.5$, the algorithm achieves optimal amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ while using linear space, hence the space-time product becomes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. We call this IVM^ϵ version, IVM^ϵ with refined partitions. Theorem 16 summarizes the main results we obtain under refined partitions.

Theorem 16. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ with refined partitions incrementally maintains the triangle count under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time, constant answer time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$ space.*

The rest of Appendix D is dedicated to the introduction of IVM^ϵ with refined partitions and the proof of Theorem 16. We emphasize on the main differences to the original IVM^ϵ algorithm that partitions each relation on a single variable.

D.1 Refined Partitions

We generalize the notion of a relation partition from Definition 6. Let K be a relation with schema \mathbf{X} and let S be a set of variables in \mathbf{X} . A partition of K on the variables in S depends on the degrees of the values of each variable in S . The partition contains a relation K_ρ for each function ρ mapping each variable in S to h or l . For instance, in case $S = \{X, Y\}$ and ρ is the function that maps X to l and Y to h , K_ρ intuitively consists of all tuples \mathbf{x} from K such that the degree of $\mathbf{x}[X]$ is low and that of $\mathbf{x}[Y]$ is high in K .

We now formalize the above intuition. Given a variable set S , we denote the set of all mappings $\rho : S \rightarrow \{h, l\}$ from S to $\{h, l\}$ by $\{h, l\}^S$.

Definition 17 (Relation Partition on Multiple Variables). *Given a relation K over schema \mathbf{X} , a set S of variables from \mathbf{X} , and a threshold θ , a partition of K on the variables in S with threshold θ is a set $\{K_\rho\}_{\rho \in \{h, l\}^S}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

Materialized View Definition	Space Complexity
$Q() = \sum_{r_A, r_B, s_B, s_C, t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}} \sum_{a, b, c} R_{r_A r_B}(a, b) \cdot S_{s_B s_C}(b, c) \cdot T_{t_C t_A}(c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{RS}(a, c) = \sum_b R_{hl}(a, b) \cdot S_{lh}(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{2-2\epsilon, 1+\epsilon\}})$
$V_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S_{hl}(b, c) \cdot T_{lh}(c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{2-2\epsilon, 1+\epsilon\}})$
$V_{TR}(c, b) = \sum_a T_{hl}(c, a) \cdot R_{lh}(a, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{2-2\epsilon, 1+\epsilon\}})$

Figure 8: The definitions and space complexities of the views in $\mathbf{V} = \{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\}$ maintained by IVM^ϵ with refined partitions as part of an IVM^ϵ state of a database \mathbf{D} for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{(union)} \quad K(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\rho \in \{h, l\}^S} K_\rho(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}) \\
& \text{(domain partition)} \quad (\pi_S R_\rho) \cap (\pi_S R_{\rho'}) = \emptyset \text{ for each pair } \rho, \rho' \in \{h, l\}^S \\
& \text{for all } \rho \in \{h, l\}^S \text{ and } Y \in S: \\
& \text{(heavy part)} \quad \text{if } \rho(Y) = h, \text{ then } |\sigma_{Y=y} K| \geq \frac{1}{2} \theta \text{ for all } y \in \pi_Y K_\rho, \\
& \text{(light part)} \quad \text{if } \rho(Y) = l, \text{ then } |\sigma_{Y=y} K| < \frac{3}{2} \theta \text{ for all } y \in \pi_Y K_\rho
\end{aligned}$$

The set $\{K_\rho\}_{\rho \in \{h, l\}^S}$ is called a strict partition of K on the variables in S with threshold θ if it satisfies the union and domain partition conditions and the following strict versions of the heavy part and light part conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for all } \rho \in \{h, l\}^S \text{ and } Y \in S: \\
& \text{(strict heavy part)} \quad \text{if } \rho(Y) = h, \text{ then } |\sigma_{Y=y} K| \geq \theta \text{ for all } y \in \pi_Y K_\rho \text{ and} \\
& \text{(strict light part)} \quad \text{if } \rho(Y) = l, \text{ then } |\sigma_{Y=y} K| < \theta \text{ for all } y \in \pi_Y K_\rho
\end{aligned}$$

A relation K_ρ is called heavy on a variable $Y \in S$ if $\rho(Y) = h$, otherwise it is light on Y .

D.2 Adaptive Maintenance under Refined Partitions

We first give an intuitive description of IVM^ϵ with refined partitions. The algorithm partitions each input relation to the triangle count query on both variables in its schema. Given an input relation $K \in \{R, S, T\}$ with schema (X, Y) and a function $\rho : \{X, Y\} \rightarrow \{h, l\}$, we denote K_ρ simply by $K_{\rho(X)\rho(Y)}$. The algorithm decomposes the triangle count query into skew-aware views of the form

$$Q_{r_A r_B s_B s_C t_C t_A}() = \sum_{a, b, c} R_{r_A r_B}(a, b) \cdot S_{s_B s_C}(b, c) \cdot T_{t_C t_A}(c, a),$$

with $r_A, r_B, s_B, s_C, t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}$. The triangle count query can be rewritten as a sum of such views:

$$Q() = \sum_{r_A, r_B, s_B, s_C, t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}} \sum_{a, b, c} R_{r_A r_B}(a, b) \cdot S_{s_B s_C}(b, c) \cdot T_{t_C t_A}(c, a).$$

The main difference to the original IVM^ϵ algorithm is that each materialized auxiliary view is composed of relations that are heavy on the variables exported by the view. This implies better bounds on the view sizes. For instance, consider a single-tuple update $\delta R_{r_A r_B}$ for some $r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}$ to relation R . IVM^ϵ with refined partitions uses an auxiliary view only for computing the delta skew-aware view $\delta Q_{r_A r_B h l l h}$. The view is of the form $V_{ST}(b, a) = \sum_c S_{hl}(b, c) \cdot T_{lh}(c, a)$. The relations S_{hl} and T_{lh} are heavy on the exported variables A and B . Figure 8 gives all three auxiliary views materialized by IVM^ϵ with refined partitions. The views V_{TR} and V_{RS} are used to facilitate delta computation under updates to the parts of relations S and T .

IVM $^\epsilon$ States with Refined Partitions. We slightly extend Definition 7. Given a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, a state of a database \mathbf{D} maintained by IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions is of the form $(\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$, where:

- N is a natural number such that the invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$ holds.
- $\mathbf{P} = \{R_{r_A r_B}\}_{r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{S_{s_B s_C}\}_{s_B, s_C \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{T_{t_C t_A}\}_{t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}}$ consists of the refined partitions of R , S , and T with threshold N^ϵ .
- \mathbf{V} consists of the materialized views in Figure 8.

In the initial state of \mathbf{D} it holds $N = 2 \cdot |\mathbf{D}| + 1$ and the partitions in \mathbf{P} are strict.

The bounds on the frequencies of data values in heavy and light relation parts mentioned after Definition 7 carry over to refined partitions: The number of distinct values of a variable in a part of relation R that is heavy on that variable is at most $\frac{N}{\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon} = 2N^{1-\epsilon}$, i.e., $|\pi_A R_{hr_B}| \leq 2N^{1-\epsilon} \geq |\pi_B R_{r_A h}|$ for any $r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}$; the number of values paired with a single data value of a variable in a part of R that is light on that variable is less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$, i.e., $|\sigma_{A=a} R_{lr_B}| < \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon > |\sigma_{B=b} R_{r_A l}|$ for any $r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}$, A -value a and B -value b . Analogous bounds hold for the parts of S and T .

D.3 Preprocessing Time Under Refined Partitions

In the preprocessing stage, IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions computes the initial state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a given database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$ such that $N = 2|\mathbf{D}| + 1$ and \mathbf{P} consists of the strict partitions of R , S , and T on $\{A, B\}$, $\{B, C\}$, and $\{C, A\}$, respectively, with threshold N^ϵ . The preprocessing time is the same as for the original IVM $^\epsilon$ algorithm.

Proposition 18. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions constructs the initial IVM $^\epsilon$ state of \mathbf{D} in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time.*

Proof. We analyze the time to construct the initial IVM $^\epsilon$ state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of \mathbf{D} . Setting the value of N is a constant-time operation. Strictly partitioning the relations can be accomplished in linear time. The triangle count Q can be computed in time $|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}}$ by using a worst-case optimal join algorithm [20]. We now analyze the time to compute the view $V_{RS}(a, c) = \sum_b R_{hl}(a, b) \cdot S_{lh}(b, c)$. The analysis for the other two auxiliary views in \mathbf{V} is analogous. The view V_{RS} can be computed in two ways. One option is to iterate over the tuples (a, b) in R_{hl} and, for each such tuple, to go over all C -values paired with b in S_{lh} . For each (a, b) in R_{hl} and (b, c) in S_{lh} , the multiplicity of (a, c) in V_{RS} is increased by $R_{hl}(a, b) \cdot S_{lh}(b, c)$. Since S_{lh} is light on B and heavy on C , it contains at most $N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}$ C -values for each B -value. Hence, the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(|R_{hl}| \cdot N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, which, due to $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Alternatively, one can iterate over the tuples (b, c) in S_{lh} and, for each such tuple, go over all A -values paired with b in R_{hl} . Since R_{hl} is light on B and heavy on A , the computation time is the same.

Thus, the overall computation time for the initial state of \mathbf{D} is dominated by the computation time for Q , which is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. \square

D.4 Space Complexity Under Refined Partitions

While the original IVM $^\epsilon$ algorithm needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, the space complexity of IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions is improved to $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$

Proposition 19. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the state of \mathbf{D} maintained by IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions to support the maintenance of the result of Query (1) takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$ space.*

Proof. We analyze the space complexity of a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a database \mathbf{D} maintained by IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions. The space occupied by ϵ and N is constant, and the size of the relation partitions in \mathbf{P} is linear.

Figure 8 gives the sizes of the views in \mathbf{V} . The size of Q is constant, since it consists of an empty tuple mapped to the triangle count. We investigate the space complexity of the auxiliary view $V_{RS}(a, c) =$

APPLYUPDATERP($\delta R_{r_A r_B}, \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta R_{r_A r_B} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_{r_A r_B}\}_{r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{S_{s_B s_C}\}_{s_B, s_C \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{T_{t_C t_A}\}_{t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}}, \{Q, V_{RS}, V_{ST}, V_{TR}\})$	
3 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B h s_C h t_A}() = \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{h s_C}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{h t_A}(c, \alpha)$ for $s_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
4 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B h h l t_A}() = \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{h h}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{l t_A}(c, \alpha)$ for $t_A \in \{h, l\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
5 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B h s_C l l}() = \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{h s_C}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{l l}(c, \alpha)$ for $s_C \in \{h, l\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
6 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B h l l h}() = \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
7 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B l s_C h t_A}() = \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{l s_C}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{h t_A}(c, \alpha)$ for $s_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
8 $\delta Q_{r_A r_B l s_C l t_A}() += \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{l s_C}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{l t_A}(c, \alpha)$ for $s_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
9 $Q() = Q() + \sum_{r_A, r_B, s_B, s_C, t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}} \delta Q_{r_A r_B s_B s_C t_C t_A}()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
10 if (r_A is h and r_B is l)	
11 $V_{RS}(\alpha, c) = V_{RS}(\alpha, c) + \delta R_{h l}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_{l h}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
12 else if ($r_A = l$ and $r_B = h$)	
13 $V_{TR}(c, \beta) = V_{TR}(c, \beta) + \delta R_{l h}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{h l}(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
14 $R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) = R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta) + \delta R_{r_A r_B}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
15 return \mathcal{Z}	
Total update time:	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 9: APPLYUPDATERP adapts the procedure APPLYUPDATE from Figure 3 to refined partitions. It takes as input an update $\delta R_{r_A r_B} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ with $r_A r_B \in \{h, l\}$ and the current IVM $^\epsilon$ state of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ and returns a new state that results from applying $\delta R_{r_A r_B}$ to \mathcal{Z} . Lines 3-8 compute the deltas of the affected skew-aware views, and Line 9 maintains Q . Lines 11 and 13 maintain the auxiliary views V_{RS} and V_{TR} , respectively. Line 14 maintains the affected part $R_{r_A r_B}$. The maintenance procedures for updates to S and T are similar.

$\sum_b R_{h l}(a, b) \cdot S_{l h}(b, c)$. The analysis for the other auxiliary views in \mathbf{V} is analogous. The view V_{RS} admits two size bounds. The first bound is the product of the size of $R_{h l}$ and the maximum number of tuples in $S_{l h}$ that match with a single tuple in $R_{h l}$, that is, the size of V_{RS} is bounded by $|R_{h l}| \cdot \max_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} \{|\sigma_{B=b} S_{l h}|\}$. Since S is light on B and heavy on C , the latter expression simplifies to $N \cdot \min\{\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon, 2N^{1-\epsilon}\} = \mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Note that swapping the roles of $R_{h l}$ and $S_{l h}$ in the above calculation does not give a better size upper bound. The second bound is obtained by taking the product of the number of all A -values in $R_{h l}$ and the number of all C -values in $S_{l h}$. Since $R_{h l}$ is heavy on A and $S_{l h}$ is heavy on C , we obtain the size bound $2N^{1-\epsilon} \cdot 2N^{1-\epsilon} = \mathcal{O}(N^{2-2\epsilon})$. Hence, the size of V_{RS} is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}, 2-2\epsilon\}}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}})$ which, due to $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}})$.

Thus, taking the linear space of the relation partitions in \mathbf{P} into account, the overall space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$. \square

D.5 Processing a Single-Tuple Update Under Refined Partitions

Figure 9 gives the procedure APPLYUPDATERP of IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions that takes as input an update $\delta R_{r_A r_B} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ with $r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}$ and a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a database \mathbf{D} and returns a new state that results from applying $\delta R_{r_A r_B}$ to \mathcal{Z} . The procedure is a straightforward extension of the procedure APPLYUPDATE described in Figure 3.

Proposition 20. *Given a state \mathcal{Z} constructed from a database \mathbf{D} for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM $^\epsilon$ with refined partitions maintains \mathcal{Z} under a single-tuple update to any input relation in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. We investigate the runtime of the procedure APPLYUPDATERP. We first analyze the evaluation strategies for computing the delta skew-aware views $\delta Q_{r_{ArB}s_Bs_Ct_Ct_A}$ with $s_B, s_C, t_C, t_A \in \{h, l\}$. The case $s_B = t_C = h$ is handled in Line 3, the case $s_B = l$ and $t_C = h$ in Line 7, and the case $s_B = t_C = l$ in Line 8. In all these cases we ignore the partitioning of the relations on their second variables and mimic the evaluation strategies for computing the delta skew-aware views $\delta Q_{r_{Ahh}}$, $\delta Q_{r_{Alh}}$, and $\delta Q_{r_{All}}$ from the procedure APPLYUPDATE in Figure 3. Hence, we get the same time complexities. The remaining delta skew-aware views, namely those where s_B is h and t_C is l , are handled in Lines 4-6. The computation of such delta views requires the iteration over all C -values paired with β in S_{hs_C} and with α in T_{lt_A} . We make a case distinction on whether S_{hs_C} and T_{lt_A} are heavy or light on s_C and t_A , respectively.

- Case $s_C = h$ (Line 4): The delta view is of the form $\delta Q_{r_{ArB}hhlt_A}() = \delta R_{r_{ArB}}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{hh}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{lt_A}(c, \alpha)$ with $t_A \in \{h, l\}$. Since S_{hh} is heavy on C , the number of distinct C -values in S_{hh} is at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$, which means that the delta computation takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time.
- Case $t_A = l$ (Line 5): The delta view is of the form $\delta Q_{r_{ArB}hscll}() = \delta R_{r_{ArB}}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{hs_C}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{ll}(c, \alpha)$ with $s_C \in \{h, l\}$. Since T_{ll} is light on A , there are less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values paired with α in T_{ll} . Hence, the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$.
- Case $s_C = l$ and $t_A = h$ (Line 6): The delta view is of the form $\delta Q_{r_{ArB}hllh}() = \delta R_{r_{ArB}}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c S_{hl}(\beta, c) \cdot T_{lh}(c, \alpha)$. Delta computation amounts to a constant-time lookup in V_{ST} .

Summing up the deltas in Line 9 takes constant time.

We now turn to the maintenance of the auxiliary views. Computing δV_{RS} (Line 11) requires the iteration over all C -values paired with β in S_{lh} . Similarly, computing δV_{TR} (Line 13) requires the iteration over all C -values paired with α in T_{hl} . Both relations S_{lh} and T_{hl} are heavy on C and light on the other variable. Hence, the number of C -values iterated over is bounded by $\min\{2N^{1-\epsilon}, \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon\}$. This implies that the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. The update of $R_{r_{ArB}}$ in Line 14 can be done in constant time.

It follows that the overall time of the procedure APPLYUPDATERP in Figure 9 is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, which, by $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

D.6 Rebalancing Refined Partitions

The trigger procedure ONUPDATERP in Figure 10 adapts the procedure ONUPDATE in Figure 4 to refined partitions. It takes as input an update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and a current state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ with refined partitions of relations of a database \mathbf{D} , maintains \mathcal{Z} under the update and, if necessary, performs major and minor rebalancing. The trigger procedures for updates relations S and T are defined analogously.

In Lines 1-8, the procedure identifies the part $R_{r_{ArB}}$ of relation R that is affected by the update. Then, it calls the procedure APPLYUPDATERP($\delta R_{r_{ArB}} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z}$), which is defined in Figure 9. If the update causes the violation of the size invariant $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$, the procedure halves or doubles N and performs major rebalancing by calling MAJORREBALANCINGRP, which, similar to MAJORREBALANCING in Figure 4, strictly repartitions the relations in \mathbf{P} with threshold N^ϵ and recomputes the auxiliary views in \mathbf{V} . As explained in Appendix D.3, recomputation of partitions and views, and hence, major rebalancing takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.

In Lines 16-23, the procedure checks whether the update causes a violation of the light or heavy part conditions from Definition 17 and, if so, performs minor rebalancing by invoking MINORREBALANCINGRP($K_{src}, K_{dst}, K'_{src}, K'_{dst}, X, x, \mathcal{Z}$) described in Figure 11. In contrast to the procedure MINORREBALANCING in Figure 4, the parameter list of MINORREBALANCINGRP contains two source relations K_{src} and K'_{src} and two target relations K_{dst} and K'_{dst} . MINORREBALANCINGRP moves all tuples in K_{src} and K'_{src} with X -value x to K_{dst} and K'_{dst} , respectively. While the procedure ONUPDATE in Figure 4 invokes MINORREBALANCING at most once per update, the procedure ONUPDATERP might call MINORREBALANCINGRP up to two times per update. We consider the case where the update affects the part R_{ll} and implies that the latter relation becomes heavy on α as well as on β . In this case, the conditions in both lines 16 and 20 hold. Note that both parts R_{ll} and R_{lh} can contain tuples from relation R with A -value α . The procedure

ONUPDATE_{RP}($\delta R, \mathcal{Z}$)

```

1  let  $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ 
2  let  $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_{r_A r_B}\}_{r_A, r_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ 
3  if  $((\alpha, \beta) \in R_{hh} \text{ or } \epsilon = 0)$ 
4    APPLYUPDATERP( $\delta R_{hh}, \mathcal{Z}$ )
5  else if  $((\alpha, \beta) \in R_{hl})$ 
6    APPLYUPDATERP( $\delta R_{hl}, \mathcal{Z}$ )
7  else if  $((\alpha, \beta) \in R_{lh})$ 
8    APPLYUPDATERP( $\delta R_{lh}, \mathcal{Z}$ )
9  else
10   APPLYUPDATERP( $\delta R_{ll}, \mathcal{Z}$ )
11  if  $(|\mathbf{D}| = N)$ 
12     $N = 2N$ 
13    MAJORREBALANCINGRP( $\mathcal{Z}$ )
14  else if  $(|\mathbf{D}| < \lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor)$ 
15     $N = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}N \rfloor - 1$ 
16    MAJORREBALANCINGRP( $\mathcal{Z}$ )
17  else
18    if  $(\alpha \in (\pi_A R_{ll} \cup \pi_A R_{lh}) \text{ and } |\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_{ll}| + |\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_{lh}| \geq \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon)$ 
19      MINORREBALANCINGRP( $R_{ll}, R_{hl}, R_{lh}, R_{hh}, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z}$ )
20    else if  $(\alpha \in (\pi_A R_{hl} \cup \pi_A R_{hh}) \text{ and } |\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_{hl}| + |\sigma_{A=\alpha} R_{hh}| < \frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon)$ 
21      MINORREBALANCINGRP( $R_{hl}, R_{ll}, R_{hh}, R_{lh}, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z}$ )
22    if  $(\beta \in (\pi_B R_{ll} \cup \pi_B R_{hl}) \text{ and } |\sigma_{B=\beta} R_{ll}| + |\sigma_{B=\beta} R_{hl}| \geq \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon)$ 
23      MINORREBALANCINGRP( $R_{ll}, R_{lh}, R_{hl}, R_{hh}, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z}$ )
24    else if  $(\beta \in (\pi_B R_{lh} \cup \pi_B R_{hh}) \text{ and } |\sigma_{B=\beta} R_{lh}| + |\sigma_{B=\beta} R_{hh}| < \frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon)$ 
25      MINORREBALANCINGRP( $R_{lh}, R_{ll}, R_{hh}, R_{hl}, A, \alpha, \mathcal{Z}$ )

```

Figure 10: ONUPDATE_{RP} adapts the procedure ONUPDATE from Figure 4 to refined partitions. It takes as input an update $\delta R = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ and a current IVM $^\epsilon$ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} and returns a state that results from applying δR to \mathcal{Z} . APPLYUPDATE_{RP} is given in Figure 9. MINORREBALANCING_{RP}($K_{src}, K_{dst}, K'_{src}, K'_{dst}, X, x, \mathcal{Z}$) is defined in Figure 11 and moves all tuples with X -value x from K_{src} and K'_{src} to K_{dst} and K'_{dst} , respectively. MAJORREBALANCING_{RP}, which is defined similarly to MAJORREBALANCING in Figure 4, strictly repartitions the relations in \mathbf{P} with threshold N^ϵ and recomputes the views in \mathbf{V} . The ONUPDATE_{RP} procedures for updates to S and T are analogous.

MINORREBALANCING_{RP} called in Line 17 moves such tuples from R_{ll} to R_{hl} and from R_{lh} to R_{hh} . Likewise, both R_{ll} and R_{hl} can contain R -tuples with B -value β . The procedure MINORREBALANCING_{RP} called in Line 21 moves these tuples from R_{ll} to R_{lh} and from R_{hl} to R_{hh} . In general, the number of tuples moved from one relation part to the other is less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon + 1$. A minor rebalancing step moves tuples between at most between two pairs of relation parts. Since each tuple move needs $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time and $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$, minor rebalancing needs overall $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon + \max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.

We now put all pieces together to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 16. As shown in Proposition 18, the preprocessing stage takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time. Constant answer time is ensured by the fact that the triangle count is materialized and maintained. By Proposition 19, the space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}, 1\}})$.

The analysis of the amortized update time follows the the proof of Theorem 3. The time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ needed to perform major rebalancing is amortized over $\Omega(N)$ updates following the previous major rebalancing step. The minor rebalancing time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon + \max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ needed to move all tuples with a specific value between relation parts is amortized over $\Omega(N^\epsilon)$ updates to tuples with the same values following the previous minor rebalancing step for that value. Hence, the amortized rebalancing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Since, by Proposition 20, the time to process a single-tuple update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, this implies that the overall amortized single-tuple update time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

```

MINORREBALANCINGRP( $K_{src}, K_{dst}, K'_{src}, K'_{dst}, X, x, \mathcal{Z}$ )
foreach  $\mathbf{t} \in \sigma_{X=x} K_{src}$  do
   $m = K_{src}(\mathbf{t})$ 
   $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATERP}(\delta K_{src} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto -m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ 
   $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATERP}(\delta K_{dst} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ 
foreach  $\mathbf{t} \in \sigma_{X=x} K'_{src}$  do
   $m = K'_{src}(\mathbf{t})$ 
   $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATERP}(\delta K'_{src} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto -m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ 
   $\mathcal{Z} = \text{APPLYUPDATERP}(\delta K'_{dst} = \{\mathbf{t} \mapsto m\}, \mathcal{Z})$ 
return  $\mathcal{Z}$ 

```

Figure 11: MINORREBALANCINGRP adapts the procedure MINORTREBALANCING from Figure 4 to refined partitions. It moves all tuples with X -value x from K_{src} to K_{dst} and from K'_{src} to K'_{dst} .

E Enumerating Triangles under Updates

We focus on the problem of enumerating all triangles in the result of the full triangle query

$$Q(a, b, c) = R(a, b) \cdot S(b, c) \cdot T(c, a)$$

under single-tuple updates to the input relations. We present an IVM^ϵ variant that requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ update time and ensures constant-delay enumeration after each update. Due to Corollary 15 in Appendix C, this is worst-case optimal for $\epsilon = 0.5$. The enumeration process reports only distinct tuples and their multiplicities in the query result.

The rest of this section is dedicated to the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 21. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ maintains the result of the full triangle query under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time, constant enumeration delay, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ space.*

E.1 Adaptive Maintenance for the Full Triangle Query

The IVM^ϵ variant employs a similar adaptive maintenance strategy as with the triangle count query. It first partitions the relations R , S , and T on the variables A , B , and C , respectively, with the same thresholds as in the original IVM^ϵ algorithm. It then decomposes Q into eight skew-aware views defined over the relation parts:

$$Q_{rst}(a, b, c) = R_r(a, b) \cdot S_s(b, c) \cdot T_t(c, a), \quad \text{for } r, s, t \in \{h, l\}.$$

Enumerating the result of Q is equivalent to enumerating the result of each Q_{rst} . As with the triangle count query, the IVM^ϵ variant customizes the maintenance strategy for each of these views and relies on auxiliary views to speed up the view maintenance.

The original IVM^ϵ algorithm, however, fails to achieve sublinear maintenance time for most of these skew-aware views. Consider for instance the view Q_{hhl} and a single-tuple update $\delta R_h = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ to the heavy part R_h of relation R . The delta $\delta Q_{hhl}(\alpha, \beta, c) = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_h(\beta, c) \cdot T_l(c, \alpha)$ iterates over linearly many C -values in the worst case. Precomputing the view $V_{ST}(b, c, a) = S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$ and rewriting the delta as $\delta Q_{hhl}(\alpha, \beta, c) = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}(\beta, c, \alpha)$ makes no improvement in the worst-case running time. In contrast, for the triangle count query, the view $V_{ST}(b, a) = S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$ enables computing δQ_{hhl} in constant time.

The skew-aware views of the full triangle query can be maintained in sublinear time by avoiding the listing (tabular) form of the view results. For that purpose, the result of a skew-aware view can be maintained in

Materialized View Definition	Space Complexity
$Q^L(a, b, c) = \sum_{u \in \{h, l\}} R_u(a, b) \cdot S_u(b, c) \cdot T_u(c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\frac{3}{2}})$
$Q_{hlt}^F(a, b, c) = R_h(a, b) \cdot S_l(b, c) \cdot T_t(c, a)$	
$V_{RS}(a, b, c) = R_h(a, b) \cdot S_l(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{RS}^{(B)}(a, c) = \sum_b V_{RS}(a, b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$Q_{hlt}(a, c) = V_{RS}^{(B)}(a, c) \cdot T_t(c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$Q_{rhl}^F(a, b, c) = R_r(a, b) \cdot S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$	
$V_{ST}(b, c, a) = S_h(b, c) \cdot T_l(c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{ST}^{(C)}(b, a) = \sum_c V_{ST}(b, c, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$Q_{rhl}(a, b) = R_r(a, b) \cdot V_{ST}^{(C)}(b, a)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$Q_{lsh}^F(a, b, c) = R_l(a, b) \cdot S_s(b, c) \cdot T_h(c, a)$	
$V_{TR}(c, a, b) = T_h(c, a) \cdot R_l(a, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{TR}^{(A)}(c, b) = \sum_a V_{TR}(c, a, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$Q_{lsh}(b, c) = S_s(b, c) \cdot V_{TR}^{(A)}(c, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$




Figure 12: (left) The materialized views $\mathbf{V} = \{Q^L, Q_{hlt}, Q_{rhl}, Q_{lsh}, V_{RS}, V_{RS}^{(B)}, V_{ST}, V_{ST}^{(C)}, V_{TR}, V_{TR}^{(A)}\}$ supporting the constant-delay enumeration of the result of the full triangle query. $r, s,$ and t stand for h or l . \mathbf{D} is the input database. The input relations are partitioned for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. The superscripts L and F denote listing and factorized forms of query results. The result of Q^L is materialized, while the results of $Q_{hlt}^F, Q_{rhl}^F,$ and Q_{lsh}^F are enumerable with constant delay using other auxiliary views (denoted by indentation). (right) The view tree for maintaining the result of Q_{hlt}^F in factorized form.

factorized form: Instead of using one materialized view, a hierarchy of materialized views is created such that each of them admits sublinear maintenance time and all of them together guarantee constant-delay enumeration of the result of the skew-aware view. This technique of factorized evaluation appears in recent publications studying incremental view maintenance [5, 14, 21].

Figure 12(left) presents the views used by IVM^ϵ to maintain the result of the full triangle query under updates to the base relations. The top-level view Q^L materializes the union of the results of Q_{hhh} and Q_{lll} in listing form. The remaining top-level views, $Q_{hlt}^F, Q_{rhl}^F,$ and Q_{lsh}^F with $r, s, t \in \{h, l\}$, avoid materialization altogether but ensure constant-delay enumeration of their results using other auxiliary materialized views (denoted by indentation).

Figure 12(right) shows the materialized views needed to maintain the result of Q_{hlt}^F for $t \in \{h, l\}$ in factorized form. These views make a view tree with input relations as leaves and updates propagating in a bottom-up manner. The result of Q_{hlt}^F is distributed among two auxiliary views, Q_{hlt} and V_{RS} . The former stores all (a, c) pairs that would appear in the result of Q_{hlt}^F , while the latter provides the matching B -values for each (a, c) pair. The two views together provide constant-delay enumeration of the result of Q_{hlt}^F . In addition to them, the view $V_{RS}^{(B)}$ serves to support constant-time updates to T_t . The view trees for Q_{rhl}^F and Q_{lsh}^F are analogous.

E.2 Preprocessing Time for the Full Triangle Query

The preprocessing stage builds the initial IVM^ϵ state $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V}, N)$ for a given database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. This step partitions the input relations and computes the views in \mathbf{V} from Figure 12 before processing any update. If \mathbf{D} is empty, the preprocessing cost is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proposition 22. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, constructing the initial IVM^ϵ state of \mathbf{D} to support the maintenance of the result of the full triangle query takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time.*

APPLYUPDATEENUM($\delta R_r(\alpha, \beta), \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R_h, R_l, S_h, S_l, T_h, T_l\},$ $\{Q^L, Q_{hlt}, Q_{rhl}, Q_{lsh}, V_{RS}, V_{RS}^{(B)}, V_{ST}, V_{ST}^{(C)}, V_{TR}, V_{TR}^{(A)}\})$	
3 if (r is h)	
4 $Q^L(\alpha, \beta, c) = Q^L(\alpha, \beta, c) + \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_h(\beta, c) \cdot T_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
5 $V_{RS}(\alpha, \beta, c) = \delta R_h(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_l(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
6 $V_{RS}^{(B)}(\alpha, c) = \delta V_{RS}(\alpha, \beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
7 $Q_{hlt}(c, \alpha) = \delta V_{RS}^{(B)}(\alpha, c) \cdot T_t(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
8 else	
9 $Q^L(\alpha, \beta, c) = \delta R_l(\alpha, \beta) \cdot S_l(\beta, c) \cdot T_l(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
10 $V_{TR}(c, \alpha, \beta) = \delta R_l(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_h(c, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
11 $V_{TR}^{(A)}(c, \beta) = V_{TR}^{(A)}(c, \beta) + \delta V_{TR}(c, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
12 $Q_{lsh}(\beta, c) = Q_{lsh}(\beta, c) + \delta V_{TR}^{(A)}(c, \beta) \cdot S_s(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
13 $Q_{rhl}(a, b) = Q_{rhl}(a, b) + \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{ST}^{(C)}(\beta, \alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
14 $R_r(\alpha, \beta) = R_r(\alpha, \beta) + \delta R_r(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
Total update time:	$\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 13: (left) Maintaining an IVM^ϵ state under a single-tuple update to support constant-delay enumeration of the result of the full triangle query. `APPLYUPDATEENUM` takes as input an update δR_r to the heavy or light part of R and the current IVM^ϵ state of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. r , s , and t stand for h or l . (right) The time complexity of computing deltas. The procedures for updates to S and T are similar.

Proof. Partitioning the input relations takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. Computing Q^L using worst-case optimal join algorithms takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time [20]. The remaining top-level views Q_{hlt}^F , Q_{rhl}^F , and Q_{lsh}^F with $r, s, t \in \{h, l\}$ are not materialized. Computing the auxiliary views V_{RS} and $V_{RS}^{(B)}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, as explained in the proof of Proposition 8. The view Q_{hlt} intersects T_t and $V_{RS}^{(B)}$ in linear time. The same reasoning applies to the other views. Thus, the overall preprocessing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. \square

E.3 Space Complexity of Maintaining the Full Triangle Query

We next analyze the space complexity of the IVM^ϵ algorithm.

Proposition 23. *Given a database \mathbf{D} , the IVM^ϵ state constructed from \mathbf{D} to support the maintenance of the result of the full triangle query takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ space.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V}, N)$ be a state of \mathbf{D} . Figure 12 summarizes the space complexity of the materialized views in \mathbf{V} . The size of \mathbf{P} and the result of Q^L is upper-bounded by $N^{\frac{3}{2}}$, the maximum number of triangles in a database of size N . The space complexity of V_{RS} , $V_{RS}^{(B)}$, V_{ST} , $V_{ST}^{(C)}$, V_{TR} , and $V_{TR}^{(A)}$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, as discussed in the proof of Proposition 8. The views Q_{hlt} , Q_{rhl} , and Q_{lsh} with $r, s, t \in \{h, l\}$ take space linear in the database size. From the invariant $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follows the claimed space complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. \square

E.4 Processing a Single-Tuple Update to the Full Triangle Query

Figure 13 shows the procedure for maintaining a current state \mathcal{Z} of the full triangle query under an update $\delta R_r(a, b)$. If the update affects the heavy part R_h of R , the procedure maintains the listing form of Q^L (line 4) and the factorized form of Q_{hlt}^F by propagating δR_h through the view tree from Figure 12 (lines 5-7). If the update affects the light part R_l of R , the procedure maintains Q^L (line 9) and propagates δR_l through the view tree for Q_{lsh}^F (lines 10-12). Finally, it updates Q_{rhl} (line 13) and the part of R affected by δR_r (line 14). The views V_{ST} and $V_{ST}^{(C)}$ remain unchanged as they do not refer to R_h or R_l .

Proposition 24. *Given a state \mathcal{Z} constructed from a database \mathbf{D} for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ to support the maintenance of the result of the full triangle query, IVM^ϵ maintains \mathcal{Z} under a single-tuple update to any input relation in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. Figure 13 shows the time complexity of each maintenance statement of the APPLYUPDATEENUM procedure, for a given single-tuple update $\delta R_r(a, b)$ and a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V}, N)$ of \mathbf{D} . This complexity is determined by the number of C -values that need to be iterated over during delta computation.

We first analyze the case when δR_r affects the heavy part R_h of R . Updating the view Q^L (line 4) requires iterating over C -values. The number of distinct C -values in the heavy part T_h is at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$. Computing δV_{RS} (line 5) needs to iterate over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values in S_l for the given b . Propagating δV_{RS} through the view tree for Q_{hlt}^F shown in Figure 12 (lines 5-7) takes time linear in the size of this delta, that is, $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$.

We now consider the case when δR_r affects the light part R_l of R . Updating Q^L (line 9) requires iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ C -values in S_l for the given b . Computing δV_{TR} (line 10) touches at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$ distinct C -values in T_h . Propagating this delta through the view tree for Q_{lsh}^F (lines 10-12) takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time.

Finally, updating Q_{rhl} and the part of R affected by δR_r takes constant time. The total execution time of the procedure from Figure 13 is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. From the invariant $|\mathbf{D}| = \Theta(N)$ follows the claimed time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. The analysis for updates to S and T is similar due to the symmetry of the triangle query and materialized views. \square

E.5 Rebalancing Partitions for the Full Triangle Query

The major rebalancing procedure for the full triangle query recomputes the materialized views from Figure 12 in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time. Minor rebalancing is accomplished by moving tuples between relation parts, as in Section 4. Hence, its time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon + \max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.

We now prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 21. The preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ follows from Proposition 22, while the space complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ follows from Proposition 23. The materialized views used by IVM^ϵ (cf. Figure 12) provide constant-delay enumeration of the full triangle query result. Materializing Q^L in listing form achieves this goal. The views Q_{hlt}^F , Q_{rhl}^F , and Q_{lsh}^F are stored in factorized form but can enumerate their results with constant delay. Figure 12 shows the view tree for Q_{hlt}^F where the views V_{RS} , $V_{RS}^{(B)}$, and Q_{hlt} are constructed and maintained in a bottom-up manner. The root Q_{hlt} contains only the (a, c) pairs that would appear in the result of Q_{hlt}^F , and for each (a, c) pair, V_{RS} provides only the B -values that exist in both R_h and S_l . Thus, iterating over Q_{hlt} and V_{RS} can enumerate the result of Q_{hlt}^F with constant delay. Similar analysis applies to Q_{rhl}^F and Q_{lsh}^F .

As in the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 4.1, the time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$ to process major rebalancing is amortized over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|)$ updates. Likewise, the time to do minor rebalancing is amortized over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ updates. Hence, the amortized major and minor rebalancing times are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, respectively. Since by Proposition 24, the time to process a single-tuple update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, the overall amortized update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

F Loomis-Whitney Count Queries

In this section, we consider the incremental maintenance of Loomis-Whitney count queries, which generalize the triangle count query. A Loomis-Whitney query of degree $n \geq 3$ is of the form

$$Q() = \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n} R_1(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}) \cdot R_2(a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \cdot \dots \cdot R_n(a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{n-2}),$$

where each relation R_i is over the schema $\mathbf{A}_i = (A_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}}$ with $i = (k \bmod n) + 1$. The triangle count query is a Loomis-Whitney query of degree 3.

It turns out that any Loomis-Whitney query can be maintained with the same complexities as the triangle count query.

Theorem 25. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ maintains any Loomis-Whitney count query under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}, \frac{1}{n-1}})$ preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time, constant answer time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.*

Given that the answer time is constant, the update time stated in Theorem 25 is worst-case optimal, conditioned on the OMv conjecture.

Proposition 26. *For any $\gamma > 0$, Loomis-Whitney count query Q , and database \mathbf{D} , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains the result of Q under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*

In the rest of Appendix F we prove Theorem 25 and Proposition 26. The proofs are similar to the triangle count case.

F.1 Adaptive Maintenance for Loomis-Whitney Queries

Consider a database $\mathbf{D} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$, a Loomis-Whitney count query Q of some degree $n \geq 3$, and a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. The IVM^ϵ variant we introduce here is very similar to the original IVM^ϵ algorithm maintaining the triangle count. It partitions each relation R_i on A_i into a light part R_i^l and a heavy part R_i^h . Then, it decomposes Q into skew-aware views expressed over the relation parts:

$$Q_{u_1 \dots u_n}() = \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n} R_1^{u_1}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}) \cdot R_2^{u_2}(a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \cdot \dots \cdot R_n^{u_n}(a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{n-2})$$

for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \{h, l\}$. The query Q is the sum of these views: $Q() = \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_n \in \{h, l\}} Q_{u_1 \dots u_n}()$.

The IVM^ϵ variant materializes, besides Q , auxiliary views V_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ that join the heavy relation part R_{i+1}^h with the light parts of all other relations but R_i . For convenience, we skip the relation schemas in the following expression:

$$V_i(a_i, \dots, a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{i-2}) = \sum_{a_{i-1}} (R_{i+1}^h \cdot R_{i+2}^l \cdot \dots \cdot R_n^l \cdot R_1^l \cdot \dots \cdot R_{i-1}^l)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In the above view definition, $i-1$ stands for n in case of $i=1$ and $i+1$ stands for 1 in case of $i=n$.

An IVM^ϵ state $(\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of \mathbf{D} is defined as usual: N is the threshold base with $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$, \mathbf{P} contains for each R_i its heavy-light partitions on variable A_i with threshold N^ϵ , and \mathbf{V} consists of Q and the auxiliary views V_1, \dots, V_n .

Proof of Theorem 25. Let Q be a Loomis-Whitney query of some degree $n \geq 3$. The analysis of the preprocessing time and space complexity follows the same reasoning as in the proofs of Propositions 8 and 10.

Preprocessing Time and Space Complexity. The FAQ-width of Q is $\frac{n}{n-1}$, hence, Q can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{n}{n-1}})$. We analyze the time to compute an auxiliary view V_i . Each tuple in R_{i+1}^h fixes the data values of all but the variable A_{i-1} . Each tuple that results from the join of R_{i+1}^h and R_{i+2}^l fixes the values of all variables in the query. Hence, V_i can be computed by iterating first over all tuples in R_{i+1}^h , and for each such tuple \mathbf{t} , iterating over all matching tuples \mathbf{t}' in R_{i+2}^l . For each matching pair \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' , we additionally look up the tuples in the other relations that agree with \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' on the common variables. Since R_{i+2}^l is light on A_{i+2} and the data value of this variable is fixed by each tuple in R_{i+1}^h , the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(|R_{i+1}^h| \cdot N^\epsilon)$. Alternatively, we can iterate over the tuples in R_{i+2}^l and search for matching tuples in R_{i+1}^h . Since the only variable whose value is not fixed by tuples from R_{i+2}^l is A_{i+1} and R_{i+1}^h is heavy on that variable, the computation time in this case is $\mathcal{O}(|R_{i+2}^l| \cdot N^{1-\epsilon})$. Hence, the overall computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\max\{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}, \frac{1}{n-1}\}})$, which, due to $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\max\{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}, \frac{1}{n-1}\}})$. The argumentation for the space complexity follows a similar reasoning.

Maintaining the Result of Q Under Single-Tuple Updates. Given an IVM $^\epsilon$ state \mathcal{Z} of database \mathbf{D} , we analyze the computation of δQ under a single-tuple update $\delta R_1^r = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}) \mapsto m\}$ to relation R_1 . The strategies for updates to the other relations are analogous. The update affects either the heavy or the light part of R . It fixes the values of all variables but variable A_n in the deltas of the skew-aware views:

$$\delta Q_{ru_2 \dots u_n}() = \delta R_1^r(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}) \cdot \sum_{a_n} R_2^{u_2}(\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, a_n) \cdot \dots \cdot R_n^{u_n}(a_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-2})$$

where $u_2, \dots, u_n \in \{h, l\}$. We distinguish four cases when computing a delta $\delta Q_{ru_2 \dots u_n}$:

1. Case where $u_2 = \dots = u_n = h$. The number of distinct A_n -values in R_n^h is upper-bounded by $\frac{N}{\frac{1}{2}N^\epsilon} = 2N^{1-\epsilon}$. Thus, computing $\delta Q_{rh \dots h}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time.
2. Case where $u_2 = \dots = u_{n-1} = h$ and $u_n = l$. To compute this delta, we use the following auxiliary view:

$$V_1(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) = \sum_{a_n} R_2^h(a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \cdot \dots \cdot R_n^l(a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{n-2}).$$

Then, computing $\delta Q_{rh \dots l}() = \delta R_1^r(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}) \cdot V_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ takes constant time.

3. Case where $\exists j \in [2, n) : u_j = l$ and $u_n = h$. Computing the delta requires either iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ A_n -values in R_j^l for the given $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ or iterating over at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$ distinct A_n -values in R_n^h . The time complexity of computing such deltas is $\mathcal{O}(\min\{\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon, 2N^{1-\epsilon}\}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.
4. Case where $\exists j \in [2, n) : u_j = l$ and $u_n = l$. Computing such deltas requires iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ A_n -values in R_j^l for the given $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ and looking up in the other relations for each $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, a_n)$. The time complexity of computing these deltas is $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$.

The overall time to compute the results of delta skew-aware views is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.

Maintaining Auxiliary Views Under Single-Tuple Updates. We analyze the time to maintain the views V_2, \dots, V_n under an update $\delta R_1^r = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}) \mapsto m\}$ to the heavy or light part of R_1 . The analysis for updates to the other relations is similar.

We distinguish two cases when computing the deltas of these views under the update δR_1^r :

1. Case where $r = h$. The only view using R_1^h is V_n . Computing δV_n means iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ A_n -values of any of the relations $\{R_i^l\}_{i \in \{3, n\}}$, for the given $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ and looking up in the remaining relations for each $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, a_n)$. This delta computation requires $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time.

2. Case where $r = l$. The update affects the views V_2, \dots, V_{n-1} , which reference R_1^l . Let V_i be a view affected by the update. In case the degree of Q is at least $n = 4$, we can compute δV_i by iterating over at most $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ A_n -values a_n of any of the relations R_j^l with $j \in \{2, n-1\} \setminus \{i\}$ and looking up each tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, a_n)$ in the remaining relations. This delta computation needs $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time. In case the degree of Q is 3, the materialized views as well as their delta computation is the same as for the triangle count query. Hence, in this case, delta computation needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.

It follows that the preprocessing time as well as the space complexity are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. The time to process a single-tuple update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Since the result of Q is materialized, the answer time is constant. Rebalancing procedures and amortization of rebalancing costs is similar to the triangle count case in Section 4. Thus, the overall amortized update time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

F.2 Worst-Case Optimality of IVM^ϵ for Loomis-Whitney Queries

We show that the amortized update time stated in Theorem 25 is worst-case optimal, conditioned on the OMv conjecture. The proof is a slight extension of the proof of Proposition 4. in Appendix C.

Proof of Proposition 26. Let Q be Loomis-Whitney count query of some degree $d \geq 3$ and assume that there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} with amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ and answer time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ that maintains the result of Q under single-tuple updates. We show that \mathcal{A} can be used to design an algorithm \mathcal{B} that solves the OuMv problem in subcubic time, which contradicts the OuMv conjecture (Conjecture 14). Since the latter conjecture relies on the OMv conjecture (Conjecture 2), this also contradicts the OMv conjecture.

Let $(\mathbf{M}, (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n))$ be an input to the OuMv problem. In the proof of Proposition 4 in Appendix C, we used the relation S to encode matrix \mathbf{M} and the relations R and T to encode the vectors \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i , respectively. Here, the matrix \mathbf{M} is encoded by the relations R_3, \dots, R_d and the vectors \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i are encoded by the relations R_1 and R_2 , respectively. We denote the entry of \mathbf{M} in row i and column j by $\mathbf{M}(i, j)$ and the i -th component of \mathbf{v} by $\mathbf{v}(i)$. Let a be some constant. Algorithm \mathcal{B} starts from an empty database $\mathbf{D} = \{R_1, \dots, R_d\}$. Then, it executes at most n^2 updates to each of the relations R_3, \dots, R_d such that $R_k = \{(A_k : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a, A_d : i, A_1 : j, A_2 : a, A_2 : a, \dots) \mapsto \mathbf{M}(i, j) \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$, for $3 \leq k \leq d$. That is, for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and each relation R_k , the algorithm inserts a tuple \mathbf{t} with multiplicity $M(i, j)$ such that $\mathbf{t}[A_d] = i$, $\mathbf{t}[A_1] = j$, and all other tuple values are fixed to a . In each round $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, it executes at most $2n$ updates to the relations R_1 and R_2 such that $R_1 = \{(A_1 : i, A_2 : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a) \mapsto \mathbf{v}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ and $R_2 = \{(A_2 : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a, A_d : i) \mapsto \mathbf{u}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. By construction, $\mathbf{u}_r^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}_r = 1$ if and only if there exist $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_r(i) = 1$, $\mathbf{M}(i, j) = 1$, and $\mathbf{v}_r(j) = 1$, which is equivalent to $R_1(A_1 : j, A_2 : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a) \cdot R_2(A_2 : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a, A_d : i) \cdot R_3(A_3 : a, \dots, A_{d-1} : a, A_d : i, A_1 : j) \cdot \dots \cdot R_d(A_d : i, A_1 : j, A_2 : a, \dots, A_{d-2} : a) = 1$. Thus, the algorithm outputs 1 at the end of round r if and only if the result of Q after round r is nonzero.

The following cost analysis is similar to the analysis in the proof of Proposition 4. The construction of the relations R_3, \dots, R_d from \mathbf{M} requires at most n^2 updates per relation. Given that the amortized time for each update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ and the database size $|\mathbf{D}|$ is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, this phase takes overall $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \cdot n^{1-2\gamma}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$ time. In each round, the algorithm performs at most $2n$ updates and outputs the result in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ time. The overall execution time is $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-2\gamma})$ per round and $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$ for n rounds. Thus, algorithm \mathcal{B} needs $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-2\gamma})$ time to solve the OuMv problem, which contradicts the OuMv conjecture and, consequently, the OMv conjecture. \square

G 4-Path Count Query

We consider the problem of incrementally maintaining the result of the following 4-path count query

$$Q() = \sum_{a,b,c} R(a) \cdot S(a,b) \cdot T(b,c) \cdot U(c)$$

under single-tuple updates to the relations R , S , T , and U with schemas (A) , (A, B) , (B, C) , and (C) , respectively. IVM^ϵ maintains the 4-path count with the same complexities as the triangle count.

Theorem 27. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ incrementally maintains the 4-path count under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized update time, constant answer time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.*

The update time in Theorem 27 is worst-case optimal for $\epsilon = 0.5$, conditioned on the OMv conjecture. This is implied by the following proposition.

Proposition 28. *For any $\gamma > 0$ and database \mathbf{D} , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains the 4-path count under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*

The IVM^ϵ maintenance strategy introduced in the following sections is easily extendible to queries that result from Q by extending each relation by unboundedly many non-join variables. Such extended relations can be replaced by views that aggregate away the non-join variables and can be updated in constant time.

In the sequel, we first prove Theorem 27 and then Proposition 28.

G.1 Adaptive Maintenance of the 4-Path Count

We present an IVM^ϵ variant that partitions relations S and T on both variables (cf. Definition 17) and leaves relations R and U unpartitioned. Hence, the partitions of S and T are of the form $\{S_{s_A, s_B}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}}$ and $\{T_{t_B, t_C}\}_{t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}}$, respectively. For instance, the relation part S_{lh} is light on A and heavy on B . The IVM^ϵ variant decomposes the query into skew-aware views of the form

$$Q_{s_A s_B t_B t_C}() = \sum_{a, b, c} R(a) \cdot S_{s_A, s_B}(a, b) \cdot T_{t_B, t_C}(b, c) \cdot U(c)$$

with $s_A, s_B, t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}$. The 4-path count can then be expressed as the sum of these skew-aware views:

$$Q() = \sum_{s_A, s_B, t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}} Q_{s_A s_B t_B t_C}()$$

Figure 14 lists all auxiliary views materialized to facilitate the computation of delta skew-aware views under updates. The IVM^ϵ variant uses some views containing indicator projections of relations, which we introduce next. An indicator projection $\exists_X K$ of a relation K on one of its variables X projects the tuples in K onto X and maps each value in the projection to multiplicity 1.

Definition 29 (Indicator Projection). *Given a relation K with schema \mathbf{X} and a variable X in \mathbf{X} , an indicator projection $\exists_X K$ of K on X is defined as*

$$\exists_X K(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists \mathbf{x} \in \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}), \text{ with } K(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[X] = x \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The views $V_{T_h}(b)$ and $V_{S_h}(b)$ in Figure 14 are defined as indicator projections of the relations T_{hl} and S_{lh} on B . The purpose of $V_{T_{hl}}$ in $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}$ is to put a sublinear bound on the number of B -values b with $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}(b) \neq 0$. The role of $V_{S_{lh}}$ in $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$ is analogous.

Given a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, an IVM^ϵ state $(\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T, U\}$ is defined as in Definition 2 with the only differences that

- $\mathbf{P} = \{R, \{S_{s_A s_B}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}}, \{T_{t_B t_C}\}_{t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}}, U\}$, where $\{S_{s_A s_B}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}}$ and $\{T_{t_B t_C}\}_{t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}}$ are the partitions of S and T , respectively, with threshold N^ϵ , and
- \mathbf{V} consists of the views given in Figure 14.

Materialized View Definition	Space Complexity
$Q() = \sum_{s_A, s_B, t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}} \sum_{a, b, c} R(a) \cdot S_{s_A s_B}(a, b) \cdot T_{t_B t_C}(b, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{RS_{ll}}(b) = \sum_a R(a) \cdot S_{ll}(a, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$V_{RS_{s_A h}}(b) = \sum_a R(a) \cdot S_{s_A h}(a, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}(a, c) = \sum_b S_{ll}(a, b) \cdot T_{lh}(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{S_{hl} T_{ll}}(a, c) = \sum_b S_{hl}(a, b) \cdot T_{ll}(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{S_{hl} T_{t_B h}}(a, c) = \sum_b S_{hl}(a, b) \cdot T_{t_B h}(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}})$
$V_{S_{hh} T_{lh}}(a, c) = \sum_b S_{hh}(a, b) \cdot T_{lh}(b, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{1+\epsilon, 2-2\epsilon\}})$
$V_{T_{ll} U}(b) = \sum_c T_{ll}(b, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$V_{T_{ht_C} U}(b) = \sum_c T_{ht_C}(b, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{T_h}(b) = \exists_B T_{hl}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{RS_{hl} T_{hl}}(b) = \sum_a R(a) \cdot S_{hl}(a, b) \cdot V_{T_h}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{RS_{ll} T_{lh}}(c) = \sum_a R(a) \cdot V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}(a, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{S_h}(b) = \exists_B S_{lh}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{S_{lh} T_{lh} U}(b) = \sum_c V_{S_h}(b) \cdot T_{lh}(b, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$V_{S_{hl} T_{ll} U}(a) = \sum_c V_{S_{hl} T_{ll}}(a, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$

Figure 14: The definitions and space complexities of the materialized views in \mathbf{V} as part of a state of a database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T, U\}$ partitioned for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

G.2 Preprocessing Time for the 4-Path Count

In the preprocessing stage, IVM^ϵ computes the initial state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a given database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T, U\}$ such that $N = 2|\mathbf{D}| + 1$ and \mathbf{P} consists of the relations R and U and the strict partitions of S and T with threshold N^ϵ .

Proposition 30. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, constructing the initial IVM^ϵ state of \mathbf{D} to support the maintenance of the 4-path count takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. Setting the value of N is a constant-time operation. Strictly partitioning the relations can be accomplished in linear time. The FAQ-width of Q is one, hence, it can be computed in linear time [1].

We can compute $V_{RS_{ll}}$ and $V_{RS_{s_A h}}$ by iterating over the tuples (a, b) in the S -part and, for each such tuple, doing a lookup of a in R . This takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ time. The analysis for $V_{T_{ll} U}$ and $V_{T_{ht_C} U}$ is analogous.

The views $V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}$, $V_{S_{hl} T_{ll}}$, $V_{S_{hl} T_{t_B h}}$ and $V_{S_{hh} T_{lh}}$ can be computed in two ways. One option is to iterate over the tuples (a, b) in the S -part and, for each such tuple, to go over all C -values paired with b in the T -part. Alternatively, we can iterate over the tuples (b, c) in the T -part and, for each such tuple, go over all A -values paired with b in the S -part. Computing the views $V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}$ and $V_{S_{hl} T_{ll}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time: T_{lh} is light on B and heavy on C , so there are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ C -values paired with each (a, b) from the S -part; likewise, S_{hl} is light on B and heavy on A , so there are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ A -values paired with each (b, c) from the T -part. We can compute the views $V_{S_{hl} T_{t_B h}}$ and $V_{S_{hh} T_{lh}}$ in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\epsilon})$: S_{hl} is light on B , so there are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ A -values paired with each tuple (b, c) from the T -part; likewise, T_{lh} is light on B , so there are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ C -values paired with each tuple (a, b) from S .

We next analyze the computation times for V_{T_h} , $V_{RS_{hl} T_{hl}}$ and $V_{RS_{ll} T_{lh}}$. The analysis for V_{S_h} , $V_{S_{lh} T_{lh} U}$ and $V_{S_{hl} T_{ll} U}$ is analogous. The view V_{T_h} can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ by performing a single pass through the T -part. The view $V_{RS_{hl} T_{hl}}$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ by iterating over the tuples (b, c) in T_{hl} and, for each such tuple, looking up b in V_{T_h} and a in R . Since the view $V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}$ is materialized, the view $V_{RS_{ll} T_{lh}}$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ by iterating over the tuples (a, c) in $V_{S_{ll} T_{lh}}$ and doing lookups for a in R .

Overall, the initial state of \mathbf{D} can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

G.3 Space Complexity of Maintaining the 4-Path Count

Proposition 31. *Given a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the IVM^ϵ state constructed from \mathbf{D} to support the maintenance of the 4-path count takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.*

Proof. We analyze the space complexity of a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a database \mathbf{D} . The space occupied by ϵ and N is constant. The size of the relation partitions in \mathbf{P} is linear.

Figure 14 gives the sizes of the views in \mathbf{V} . The size of Q is constant, since it consists of an empty tuple mapped to the result of the query. The views $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{t_{B^h}}}$ and $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$ admit two size bounds. The first bound is the product of the size of the S -part and the maximum number of tuples in the T -part that match with a single tuple in the S -part, i.e., $|S_{s_{ASB}}| \cdot \max_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} \{|\sigma_{B=b}T_{t_{B^h}}|\}$, or symmetrically, the product of the size of the T -part and the maximum number of tuples in the S -part that match with a single tuple in the T -part, i.e., $|T_{t_{AtB}}| \cdot \max_{b \in \text{Dom}(B)} \{|\sigma_{B=b}S_{s_{ASB}}|\}$. It follows that these views admit the size bound $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, because in $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$ and $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$, the relation part T_{lh} is heavy on C and light on B , and in $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}$ and $V_{S_{hl}T_{t_{B^h}}}$, the relation part S_{hl} is heavy on A and light on B . The second bound is obtained by taking the product of the number of all possible A -values in the S -part and the number of all possible C -values in the T -part. Hence, the views $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$ and $V_{S_{hl}T_{t_{B^h}}}$ admit the size bound $\mathcal{O}(N^{2-2\epsilon})$, because the S -part is heavy on A and the T -part is heavy on C . Thus, the size bound of these views is the minimum of these two bounds.

We next analyze the space complexity of the views $V_{RS_{ll}}$ and $V_{RS_{s_{A^h}}}$. The analysis for the views $V_{T_{ll}U}$ and $V_{T_{ht}C}$ is analogous. The space complexity of the views $V_{RS_{ll}}$ and $V_{RS_{s_{A^h}}}$ are $\mathcal{O}(N)$ and $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$, respectively, because there could be linearly many B -values in S_{ll} and at most $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ B -values in $S_{s_{A^h}}$.

Finally, we analyze the space complexity of the views V_{T_h} , $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}$, and $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}$. The analysis for the views V_{S_h} , $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$ and $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}$ is analogous. The size of the view V_{T_h} is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ because there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ distinct B -values in T_{hl} . The size of the view $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}$ is bounded by the number of B -values in S_{hl} and V_T . Since there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ B -values in V_{T_h} , the space complexity of $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$. Similarly, the size of the view $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}$ is bounded by the number of C -values in T_{lh} . Since T_{lh} is heavy on C , there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ C -values in T_{lh} , thus, the space complexity of $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$.

Hence, taking the linear space of the relation partitions in \mathbf{P} into account, the overall space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

G.4 Processing a Single-Tuple Update to the 4-Path Count

Figure 15 presents the procedure `APPLYUPDATE4PATH` that takes as input an update to R and a state $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V})$ of a database \mathbf{D} with $\mathbf{P} = \{R\} \cup \{S_{s_{ASB}}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{T_{t_{B^h}}\}_{t_B, t_C \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{U\}$ and materialized views \mathbf{V} as defined in Figure 14. The procedure maintains \mathcal{Z} under the update. Figure 16 gives the procedure for updates to S . The procedures for updates to U and T are analogous to the maintenance procedures for updates to R and S , respectively.

Proposition 32. *Given a state \mathcal{Z} constructed from a database \mathbf{D} for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ to support the maintenance of the 4-path count, IVM^ϵ maintains \mathcal{Z} under a single-tuple update to any input relation in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time.*

Proof. We first consider updates to R and then to S .

Updates to R . We analyze the computation time of the procedure `APPLYUPDATE4PATH` for an update $\delta R = \{(\alpha) \mapsto m\}$ as given in Figure 15. The time to maintain the materialized views is determined by the number of B - or C -values needed to be iterated over during delta computation.

We first analyze the computation of the deltas of the views that use views composed of a T -part and U , i.e., the computation of the deltas δQ_{lll} , δQ_{llht_C} , δQ_{llhl} , δQ_{lhht_C} , δQ_{hlhl} , δQ_{hhll} , and δQ_{hhht_C} (in lines 3,

APPLYUPDATE4PATH($\delta R, \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta R = \{(\alpha) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R, U\} \cup \{S_{s_A s_B}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{T_{t_A t_B}\}_{t_A, t_B \in \{h, l\}},$ $\{Q, V_{RS_{ll}}, V_{RS_{lh}}, V_{RS_{hh}}, V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}, V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}, \}$ $V_{T_{ll}U}, V_{T_{hl}U}, V_{T_{hh}U}, V_{T_h}, V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}, V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}, V_{S_h}, V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}, V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}\}$	
3 $\delta Q_{lll}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{ll}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ll}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
4 $\delta Q_{llh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_c V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
5 $\delta Q_{llht_C}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{ll}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ht_C}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
6 $\delta Q_{lhl}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{lh}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ll}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
7 $\delta Q_{lhlh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{lh}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
8 $\delta Q_{lhhht_C}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{lh}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ht_C}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
9 $\delta Q_{hll}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}(\alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
10 $\delta Q_{hllh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{hl}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{hl}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
11 $\delta Q_{hlt_Bh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_c V_{S_{hl}T_{t_Bh}}(\alpha, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
12 $\delta Q_{hhh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{hh}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ll}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
13 $\delta Q_{hhh}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_c V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
14 $\delta Q_{hhhht_C}() = \delta R(\alpha) \cdot \sum_b S_{hh}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_{ht_C}U}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
15 $Q() = Q() + \sum_{s_A, s_B, t_A, t_B \in \{h, l\}} \delta Q_{s_A s_B t_A t_B}()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
16 $V_{RS_{ll}}(b) = V_{RS_{ll}}(b) + \delta R(\alpha) \cdot S_{ll}(\alpha, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
17 $V_{RS_{lh}}(b) = V_{RS_{lh}}(b) + \delta R(\alpha) \cdot S_{lh}(\alpha, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{1-\epsilon\}})$
18 $V_{RS_{hh}}(b) = V_{RS_{hh}}(b) + \delta R(\alpha) \cdot S_{hh}(\alpha, b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
19 $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}(b) = V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}(b) + \delta R(\alpha) \cdot S_{hl}(\alpha, b) \cdot V_{T_h}(b)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
20 $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}(c) = V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}(c) + \delta R(\alpha) \cdot V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
21 $R(\alpha) = R(\alpha) + \delta R(\alpha)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
22 return \mathcal{Z}	
	Total update time: $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 15: (left) Maintaining the result of the 4-path count under a single-tuple update to R . APPLYUPDATE4PATH takes as input an update δR and the current IVM $^\epsilon$ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. It returns a new state that results from applying δR to \mathcal{Z} . s_A, s_B, t_B , and t_C can be l or h . Lines 5-16 compute the deltas of the affected skew-aware views. Line 17 maintains Q . Lines 18-22 maintain the auxiliary views affected by this update. Line 23 maintains the affected R . (right) The time complexity of computing and applying deltas. The maintenance procedures for updates to U is analogous.

APPLYUPDATE4PATH($\delta S_{s_A s_B}, \mathcal{Z}$)	Time
1 let $\delta S_{s_A s_B} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$	
2 let $\mathcal{Z} = (\epsilon, N, \{R, U\} \cup \{S_{s_A s_B}\}_{s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}} \cup \{T_{t_A t_B}\}_{t_A, t_B \in \{h, l\}},$ $\{Q, V_{RS_{ll}}, V_{RS_{lh}}, V_{RS_{hh}}, V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}, V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}, V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}, \}$ $V_{T_{ll}U}, V_{T_{hl}U}, V_{T_{hh}U}, V_{T_h}, V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}, V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}, V_{S_h}, V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}, V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}\}$	
3 $\delta Q_{s_A s_B ll}() = R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c T_{ll}(\beta, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
4 $\delta Q_{s_A s_B lh}() = R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c T_{lh}(\beta, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
5 $\delta Q_{s_A s_B hl}() = R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot V_{T_{hl}U}(\beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
6 $\delta Q_{s_A s_B hh}() = R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c T_{hh}(\beta, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
7 $Q() = Q() + \sum_{s_A, s_B, t_A, t_B \in \{h, l\}} \delta Q_{s_A s_B t_A t_B}()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
8 if (s_A is h and s_B is h)	
9 $V_{RS_{hh}}(\beta) = V_{RS_{hh}}(\beta) + R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{hh}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
10 $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) = V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) + \delta S_{hh}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{lh}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
11 else if (s_A is l and s_B is h)	
12 $V_{RS_{lh}}(\beta) = V_{RS_{lh}}(\beta) + R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{lh}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
13 $V_{S_h}(\beta) = V_{S_h}(\beta) + \delta S_{lh}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
14 else if (s_A is h and s_B is l)	
15 $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}(\alpha, c) = V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}(\alpha, c) + \delta S_{hl}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{ll}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
16 $V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) = V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) + \delta S_{hl}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{lh}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
17 $V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}(\alpha, c) = V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}(\alpha, c) + \delta S_{hl}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{hh}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
18 $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}(\alpha) = V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}(\alpha) + \delta S_{hl}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \sum_c T_{ll}(\beta, c) \cdot U(c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
19 else	
20 $V_{RS_{ll}}(\beta) = V_{RS_{ll}}(\beta) + R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{ll}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
21 $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) = V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}(\alpha, c) + S_{ll}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{lh}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
22 $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}(c) = V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}(c) + R(\alpha) \cdot \delta S_{ll}(\alpha, \beta) \cdot T_{lh}(\beta, c)$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
23 $S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) = S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta) + \delta S_{s_A s_B}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
24 return \mathcal{Z}	
Total update time:	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Figure 16: (left) Maintaining the result of the 4-path count under a single-tuple update to relation S . APPLYUPDATE4PATH takes as input an update $\delta S_{s_A s_B}$ with $s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}$ to a part S and the current IVM $^\epsilon$ state \mathcal{Z} of a database \mathbf{D} partitioned using $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. It returns a new state that results from applying $\delta S_{s_A s_B}$ to \mathcal{Z} . s_A, s_B, t_B , and t_C can be l or h . Lines 5-8 compute the deltas of the affected skew-aware views. Line 9 maintains Q . Lines 10-25 maintain the auxiliary views affected by the update. Line 26 maintains the affected S . (right) The time complexity of computing and applying deltas. The maintenance procedures for updates to T is analogous.

5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14). We can choose between two options when computing these deltas. We can iterate over the B -values paired with α in the S -part and look up these B -values in the view that joins the T -part with U . Alternatively, we can iterate over the B -values b in the view that joins the T -part with U and look up the tuples (α, b) in the S -part. The complexity is determined by the number of B -values we iterate over. Computing δQ_{lll} (line 3) needs $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time, since S_{ll} is light on A . Computing δQ_{llht_C} , δQ_{lhl} , and δQ_{lhht_C} (lines 5, 6 and, 8) needs $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, since the S -part is light on A and either the S -part is heavy on B or there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ distinct B -values in the view that joins the T -part with U . Computing δQ_{hll} and δQ_{hhht_C} (lines 12 and 14) needs $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time, because S_{hh} is heavy on B .

We next analyze the time to compute the delta views that use views that join the S -part and the T -part, i.e., the computation times for δQ_{llh} , $\delta Q_{hlt_{Bh}}$, and δQ_{hllh} (lines 4, 11, and 13). To compute these delta views we need to iterate over the C -values paired with α in the view that joins the S -part and the T -part and to look up the C -values in U . The complexity is determined by the number of C -values we need to iterate over. Since there are at most $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ distinct C -values in the views $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{Bh}}$, and $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$, the time complexity of computing these deltas is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$.

Computing δQ_{lhlh} (line 7) needs the iteration over the B -values paired with α in $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$ and the lookups of these B -values in $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$. Since S_{lh} is heavy on B and light on A , the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Note that in the definition of δQ_{lhlh} , the S -part occurs twice: once outside the view $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$ and once within $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$. However, $V_{S_{lh}T_{lh}U}$ uses just an indicator projection of the S -part. Hence, the multiplicities in the S -part do not contribute twice to the computation of δQ_{lhlh} . Computing δQ_{hll} (line 9) requires a single lookup of α in $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}$, which takes constant time.

We now analyze the maintenance time for the auxiliary views. Maintaining $V_{RS_{ll}}$, $V_{RS_{lh}}$, and $V_{RS_{hh}}$ (lines 16-18) requires the iteration over all B -values paired with α in the S -part. Maintaining $V_{RS_{ll}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time, since S_{ll} is light on A . Maintaining $V_{RS_{hh}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time, since S_{hh} is heavy on B . Maintaining $V_{RS_{lh}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, since S_{lh} is light on A and heavy on B .

Maintaining $V_{RS_{hl}T_{hl}}$ requires to iterate over all distinct B -values in V_{T_h} and to do lookups of (α, b) in S_{hl} . Since there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ B -values in V_{T_h} , the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$. Maintaining $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}$ requires the iteration over all B -values paired with α in $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$. Since there are $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ B -values in $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$, the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$.

It follows that the overall computation time of the procedure APPLYUPDATE4PATH in Figure 15 is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, which, by $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.

Updates to S . Given an update $\delta S_{s_A s_B} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto m\}$ with $s_A, s_B \in \{h, l\}$, we analyze the computation time of the procedure APPLYUPDATE4PATH in Figure 16

Computing $\delta Q_{s_A s_B ll}$, $\delta Q_{s_A s_B lh}$, and $\delta Q_{s_A s_B hh}$ (lines 3, 4 and 6) requires the iteration over all C -values in the T -part and the lookups of these C -values in U . The computation time is determined by the number of C -values needed to be iterated over. Computing $\delta Q_{s_A s_B ll}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time, since T_{ll} is light on B . Computing $\delta Q_{s_A s_B hh}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time, since T_{hh} is heavy on C . Computing $\delta Q_{s_A s_B lh}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, since T_{lh} is light on B and heavy on C . Computing $\delta Q_{s_A s_B hl}$ (line 5) takes constant time, because it only requires the lookup of α in R and β in $V_{T_{hl}U}$.

We next analyze the maintenance of the auxiliary views. Maintaining $V_{RS_{hh}}$, $V_{RS_{lh}}$, and $V_{RS_{ll}}$ (lines 9, 12 and 20) takes constant time, because it only requires the lookup of α in R . Maintaining $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}$, $V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}$, and $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$ (lines 10, 15-17 and 21) requires the iteration over all C -values paired with β in the T -part. The computation time is determined by the number of C -values needed to be iterated over. Maintaining $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$ time, because T_{ll} is light on B . Maintaining $V_{S_{hl}T_{hh}}$ and $V_{S_{ll}T_{lh}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$ time, because T_{hh} and T_{lh} are heavy on C . Maintaining $V_{S_{hh}T_{lh}}$ and $V_{S_{hl}T_{lh}}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time, since T_{lh} is heavy on C and light on B .

Maintaining V_{S_h} (line 13) takes constant time. Maintaining $V_{S_{hl}T_{ll}U}$ (line 18) needs the iteration over all C -values paired with β in T_{ll} and the lookups of these C -values in U . The computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$, because T_{ll} is light on B . Maintaining $V_{RS_{ll}T_{lh}}$ (line 22) requires the iteration over all C -values paired with β in T_{lh} . The computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, because T_{lh} is heavy on C and light on B .

We derive that the computation time of the procedure `APPLYUPDATE4PATH` for updates to relation S is $\mathcal{O}(N^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, which, by $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.

Hence, the overall computation time of the procedure `APPLYUPDATE4PATH` for updates to R and S is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. \square

G.5 Rebalancing Partitions for the 4-Path Count

The rebalancing strategy for the 4-path count follows the rebalancing strategy for the triangle count given in Section 4. A major rebalancing step repartitions the relations strictly according to the new threshold and recomputes all materialized auxiliary views. Repartitioning relations can be done in linear time. It follows from Proposition 30 that the auxiliary views can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. This computation time is amortized over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|)$ updates. A minor rebalancing step deletes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ tuples in a relation part and inserts them into the other relation part. By Proposition 32, this takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ time. This computation time is amortized over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ updates. This means that a rebalancing step needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ amortized time.

Now, we can prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 27. It follows from Propositions 30 and 31 that the preprocessing time and the space complexity are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. By Proposition 32, the time to process a single-tuple update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Since the amortized rebalancing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, the overall amortized update time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Since the 4-path count is materialized and maintained, the answer time is constant. \square

G.6 Worst-Case Optimality of IVM^ϵ for the 4-Path Count

For $\epsilon = 0.5$, IVM^ϵ maintains the 4-path count with amortized $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ update time and constant answer time. By the lower bound given in Proposition 28, this is worst-case optimal, conditioned on the `OMv` conjecture (Conjecture 2). We next prove this proposition.

Proof of Proposition 28. The proof is a simple extension of the lower bound proof for the triangle count (Proposition 4). We reduce the `OuMv` problem given in Definition 13 to the incremental maintenance of the 4-path count. We emphasize on the differences to the reduction in the proof of Proposition 4.

Assume that there is a dynamic algorithm maintaining the 4-path count with arbitrary preprocessing time, amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$, and answer time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$. This algorithm can be used to solve the `OuMv` problem in subcubic time. This contradicts the `OuMv` conjecture.

Let $(\mathbf{M}, (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n))$ be an input to the `OuMv` problem. The idea is to use relation S to encode the matrix \mathbf{M} and to use relations R and T to encode the vectors \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i , respectively. We fill relation U with a “dummy” tuple not contributing to the final count. After the construction of the initial IVM^ϵ state for an empty database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T, U\}$, we execute at most n^2 updates to relation S such that $S = \{(i, j) \mapsto \mathbf{M}(i, j) \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. Then, we execute an additional update to U such that $U = \{(a) \mapsto 1\}$. In each round $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we execute at most $2n$ updates to the relations R and T such that $R = \{(i) \mapsto \mathbf{u}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ and $T = \{(i, a) \mapsto \mathbf{v}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. At the end of round r , the algorithm outputs 1 if and only if the 4-path count is nonzero. The time analysis of the reduction follows the proof of Proposition 4. \square

H Count Queries with Three Relations

We investigate the incremental maintenance of 3R queries, i.e., count queries with three relations. We design IVM^ϵ strategies that maintain 3R queries in worst-case optimal time (conditioned on the `OMv` conjecture).

We consider queries composed of three relations R , S , and T with schemas $(\mathbf{A}_R, \mathbf{A}_{RT}, \mathbf{A}_{RS}, \mathbf{A}_{RST})$, $(\mathbf{A}_S, \mathbf{A}_{RS}, \mathbf{A}_{ST}, \mathbf{A}_{RST})$, and $(\mathbf{A}_T, \mathbf{A}_{ST}, \mathbf{A}_{RT}, \mathbf{A}_{RST})$, respectively, where \mathbf{A}_R , \mathbf{A}_S , \mathbf{A}_T , \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , \mathbf{A}_{ST} , and \mathbf{A}_{RST} are possibly empty tuples of variables. The tuples are pairwise disjoint, i.e., the same variable does not occur in two distinct tuples. The index of each tuple indicates in which relations the variables in

the tuple occur. For instance, all variables in \mathbf{A}_{RS} occur in R and in S , but none of them occurs in T . Given such a tuple \mathbf{A}_I with some index I , we use \mathbf{a}_I to denote a tuple of data values over \mathbf{A}_I . For simplicity, we skip the indices under the summation symbols in queries. By convention, the sum in a query goes over all data values in the domains of the non-free variables of the query. In count queries, all variables are bound.

Definition 33 (3R Queries). *A 3R query is of the form*


$$Q() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}).$$

By skipping a tuple \mathbf{a}_I in a 3R query, we indicate that the corresponding variable tuple \mathbf{A}_I is empty. We call the tuples \mathbf{A}_R , \mathbf{A}_S , and \mathbf{A}_T non-join tuples and the tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} pair-join variable tuples.

Example 34. To simplify presentation, we often show the hypergraphs of 3R queries. The hypergraph of a query contains a node for each variable tuple and a hyperedge for each relation in the query. A hyperedge corresponding to a relation includes those nodes in the hypergraph that represent variable tuples in the schema of the relation. Consider the 3R query

$$Q() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}).$$

The tuple \mathbf{a}_{ST} is skipped in the query, which means that the corresponding variable tuple \mathbf{A}_{ST} is empty. The following figure shows on the left-hand side the hypergraph of Q that indicates that the variable tuples \mathbf{A}_T , \mathbf{A}_R , and \mathbf{A}_{RS} are nonempty and the tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_S , and \mathbf{A}_{RST} are *possibly* empty. The hypergraph of δQ under an update $\delta R(\alpha_R, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ to R is given on the right-hand side.



As shown in the figure, we represent a nonempty variable tuple by a filled circle, and a possibly empty variable tuple by a non-filled circle. A hyperedge representing an update is depicted in gray. \square

Next, we define classes of 3R queries with a bound on the number of nonempty pair-join variable tuples.


Definition 35 (3R Query Classes). *Given $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ the class of 3R queries with exactly i nonempty pair-join variable tuples is denoted by $3R^i$.*

Observe that $3R = \bigcup_{i=0}^3 3R^i$.

Example 36. Let

- $Q_1() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$,
- $Q_2() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{RT})$,
- $Q_3() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{ST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{ST})$, and
- $Q_4() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$,

where all data value tuples given in the queries are over nonempty variable sets. The hypergraphs of the queries are depicted below. For instance, in Q_2 , the variable tuples \mathbf{A}_T , \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_S are nonempty while \mathbf{A}_R , \mathbf{A}_{ST} , and \mathbf{A}_{RST} are empty.



The query Q_1 is a $3R^3$ query, since all three pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are nonempty. The query is cyclic and non-hierarchical (for a definition of hierarchical queries, see Appendix H.4. The query Q_2 with its two nonempty pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{RS} belongs to the class $3R^2$. It is a non-hierarchical path query. The pair-join variable tuple \mathbf{A}_{ST} is nonempty in Q_3 . The other two pair-join variable tuples are empty. Therefore, it is a $3R^1$ query. The query Q_4 is a $3R^0$ query, since it does not have any nonempty pair-join variable tuple. The latter two queries are acyclic and hierarchical. \square

The maintenance complexity of a $3R$ query depends on the number of its nonempty pair-join variable tuples. The relationship between the number of such tuples and the simplicity of the structure of a query is evident: $3R^3$ queries are cyclic with the triangle count being the simplest query of this class. The queries in the class $3R^2$ are acyclic and it is well-known that such queries admit good computational behaviour [4]. Finally, the class $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ consists of all hierarchical $3R$ queries (Proposition 41), for which it is already known that they can be maintained with constant update and answer time [5]. The following theorem summarizes our main results on $3R$ queries.

Theorem 37. *Given a $3R$ query, a database \mathbf{D} and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, IVM^ϵ maintains the query under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with the complexities given in Table 1.*

Query Class		Maintenance Complexities
$3R^3$	preprocessing time	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\frac{3}{2}})$
	update time	amortized $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
	answer time	constant
	space	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$3R^2$	preprocessing time	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
	update time	amortized $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
	answer time	constant
	space	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$3R^0 \cup 3R^1$	preprocessing time	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
	update time	(non-amortized) constant
	answer time	constant
	space	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$

Table 1: The time and space complexities of maintaining $3R$ queries with IVM^ϵ .

Theorem 37 states that IVM^ϵ recovers the result that hierarchical queries can be maintained with constant-time updates [5]. This result is obviously optimal with respect to update and answer times. The following Proposition 38 implies that for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, the update and answer times for the other query classes in Theorem 37 are optimal as well.

Proposition 38. *For any $\gamma > 0$ and database \mathbf{D} , there is no algorithm that incrementally maintains a $3R^i$ query with $i \in \{2, 3\}$ under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with arbitrary preprocessing time, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$ amortized update time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$ answer time, unless the OMv conjecture fails.*

As a corollary of Theorem 37 and Proposition 38 we derive that IVM^ϵ achieves for each 3R query the worst-case optimal update time with constant answer time:

Corollary 39 (Theorem 37 and Proposition 38). *Given a 3R query Q and a database \mathbf{D} , IVM^ϵ incrementally maintains Q under single-tuple updates to \mathbf{D} with worst-case optimal update time and constant answer time. If Q is a $3R^i$ query with $i \in \{2, 3\}$, the update time is amortized $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and worst-case optimality is conditioned on the OMv conjecture. If Q is a $3R^i$ query with $i \in \{0, 1\}$, the update time is (non-amortized) constant.*

In Appendix H.1 we introduce a general IVM^ϵ strategy for the incremental maintenance of arbitrary 3R queries. In Appendices H.2 - H.4 we show that this generic strategy admits the optimal results for the query classes in Theorem 37. In Appendix H.4 we additionally show that $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ consists of all hierarchical 3R queries.

H.1 A General IVM^ϵ Strategy for 3R Queries

In this section we generalize the IVM^ϵ strategy for the maintenance of the triangle count to arbitrary 3R queries. In Sections 3 and 4 we have seen that the IVM^ϵ approach consists of three basic components: relation partitioning, view materialization, and delta evaluation. In Appendices H.1.1, H.1.2, and H.1.3) we introduce the relation partitioning, views and delta evaluation strategies for 3R queries. In case of $3R^i$ queries with $i \leq \{0, 1\}$, the evaluation strategies undergo an optimization phase, which we explain in Appendix H.1.4. Afterwards, we give the definition of an IVM^ϵ state for 3R queries (Appendix H.1.5). Then, we analyze the space and time complexities of the introduced views and delta evaluation strategies (Appendices H.1.6 and H.1.7). In Appendices H.2 - H.4 we show that restricting the general IVM^ϵ strategy to specific 3R classes results in specialized strategies admitting the complexity results given in Table 1.

Note that each relation in a 3R query can be replaced by a view that aggregates away the non-join variables. Such views admit linear space and constant update time. Hence, without loss of generality, we assume in the following that in all considered queries the non-join variable tuples are empty. For the rest of Appendix H we fix an $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

H.1.1 Relation Partitioning

Unlike the triangle case where the partition of a relation is based on the degrees of values over a *single* variable, the partition of a relation in a 3R query can depend on the degrees of value tuples. The following definition slightly extends Definition 6 in this respect. Note the difference between the partitioning introduced in Definition 17 and the one introduced in the following Definition 40. In the former case, a relation is partitioned on each variable from a variable set. In the latter case, a tuple of variables is treated like a single variable.

Definition 40 (Relation Partition for 3R Queries). *Given a relation K over schema X , a tuple \mathbf{A} of variables from the schema of K , and a threshold θ , a partition of K on \mathbf{A} with threshold θ is a set $\{K_h, K_l\}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{union}) \quad & K(\mathbf{x}) = K_h(\mathbf{x}) + K_l(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \text{Dom}(\mathbf{X}) \\ (\text{domain partition}) \quad & (\pi_{\mathbf{A}} K_h) \cap (\pi_{\mathbf{A}} K_l) = \emptyset \\ (\text{heavy part}) \quad & \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in \pi_{\mathbf{A}} R_h : |\sigma_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}} R_h| \geq \frac{1}{2} \theta \\ (\text{light part}) \quad & \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in \pi_{\mathbf{A}} R_l : |\sigma_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}} R_l| < \frac{3}{2} \theta \end{aligned}$$

The set $\{K_h, K_l\}$ is called a *strict partition* of K on \mathbf{A} with threshold θ if it satisfies the union and domain partition conditions and the following strict versions of the heavy part and light part conditions:




Figure 17: (left) The hypergraph of a skew-aware view $Q_{R_l S_h T_l}$. (center) The hypergraph the delta view $\delta Q_{R_l S_h T_l}$ under an update δR_l . (right) The hypergraph the delta view obtained from $\delta Q_{R_l S_h T_l}$ by replacing relations S_h and T_l by a view.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{strict heavy part}) \quad & \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in \pi_{\mathbf{A}} K_h : |\sigma_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}} K_h| \geq \theta \\
 (\text{strict light part}) \quad & \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in \pi_{\mathbf{A}} K_l : |\sigma_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}} K_l| < \theta
 \end{aligned}$$

As usual, we call the relations K_h and K_l the *heavy* and the *light* part of K , respectively. IVM^ϵ does not necessarily partition all relations of 3R queries. Given a 3R query as in Definition 33, we assign each relation $K \in \{R, S, T\}$ a tuple of partition variables. We define the partition variable tuples of R , S , and T as \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} , respectively. IVM^ϵ partitions a relation K on its partition variable tuple if the latter tuple is nonempty. Otherwise, relation K is not partitioned. In the former case we define the parts of K as $\text{parts}(K) = \{K_l, K_h\}$. In case K is not partitioned, we set $\text{parts}(K) = \{K\}$. Just like in the triangle case, the precise threshold of the partitions depends on the current database in an IVM^ϵ state, which will be defined in Appendix H.1.5.

H.1.2 Materialized Views

We define skew-aware views similarly to the triangle case. Given $R' \in \text{parts}(R)$, $S' \in \text{parts}(S)$, and $T' \in \text{parts}(T)$, a skew-aware view $Q_{R'S'T'}$ results from a 3R query Q by replacing the relations R , S , and T by R' , S' , and T' , respectively. Let SAV be the set of all skew-aware views of Q . The query Q can be written as a union of skew-aware views: $Q() = \sum_{Q' \in \text{SAV}} Q'()$. Thanks to the delta rules in Section 2, the delta of Q under a single-tuple update is the sum of the deltas of the skew-aware views. In addition to the query Q , which returns the final count result, IVM^ϵ maintains auxiliary views that help to compute the deltas of skew-aware views in sublinear time. These views are simple generalizations of the views used for the triangle count. Figure 18 lists all auxiliary views maintained by IVM^ϵ . The index of a view identifier indicates the relation parts the view is composed of. A view is identified by the set of relation parts occurring in the view and its tuple of free variables. For instance, the view $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ is composed of S_h and T_l and its tuple of free variables is $(\mathbf{A}_{RT}, \mathbf{A}_{RS}, \mathbf{A}_{RST})$. In Figure 18, each set of four auxiliary views between two lines builds a group. Observe that the views in the second group result from the first group by replacing R , S , and T by S , T , and R , respectively. The third group is obtained from the second one by applying the same replacement rules.

We give an intuitive explanation in which cases auxiliary views are useful. Assume that each relation is strictly partitioned with threshold $|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon$ where $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$. We derive two bounds on the partition $\{R_l, R_h\}$ similar to the triangle count case: given any tuple \mathbf{a}_{RT} , the number of tuples $(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ paired with \mathbf{a}_{RT} in R_l is less than $|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon$; the number of tuples in $\pi_{\mathbf{A}_{RT}} R_h$ is at most $\frac{|\mathbf{D}|}{|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon} = |\mathbf{D}|^{1-\epsilon}$. The bounds for the partitions $\{S_l, S_h\}$ and $\{T_l, T_h\}$ are analogous. Consider the skew-aware view $Q_{R_l S_l T_h}() = \sum R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$. Assume that we would like to compute the delta $\delta Q_{R_l S_l T_h}() = \delta R_l(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\alpha_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ under an update $\delta R_l = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$. The sum in the delta view is defined over all tuples \mathbf{a}_{ST} paired with $(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_l and with $(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in T_h . Since S_l is light, the number of \mathbf{a}_{ST} -tuples paired

Materialized View	Space
$Q() = \sum_{Q' \in SAV} Q'()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
if $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, materialize $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RT} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RS} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$ materialize $V_{S T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RS} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RT} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{S T_t}(\mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_t(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ for each $T_t \in \{T_l, T_h\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_l T_h}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RS} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_l T_h}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{ST} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_l T}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{ST} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{RS} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_r T}(\mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_r(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ for each $R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RT} \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{ST} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RT} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{ST} \neq \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
if $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{A}_{RT} = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{A}_{ST} = \emptyset$, materialize $V_{R S_s}(\mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_s(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ for each $S_s \in \{S_l, S_h\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$

Figure 18: The definitions and space complexities of all views materialized by IVM^ε for the maintenance of a 3R query. *SAV* is the set of all skew-aware views. The views are defined over a database \mathbf{D} partitioned for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$.

with $(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_l is less than $|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon$. Furthermore, since T_h is heavy, the number of distinct tuples over \mathbf{A}_{ST} in T_h can be at most $|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\epsilon}$. Therefore, the sum in $\delta Q_{R_l S_l T_h}$ iterates over at most $|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}}$ relevant \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples. In Appendix H.1.3 it will be shown that $\delta Q_{R_l S_l T_h}$ can indeed be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.

One delta query where sublinear delta computation requires the exploitation of additional auxiliary views is $\delta Q_{R_l S_h T_l}() = \delta R_l(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_h(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$. This case is demonstrated in Figure 17. In this case, there is no sublinear bound on the number of \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples that are paired with $(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_h and with $(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in T_l . Therefore, IVM^ϵ materializes the auxiliary view $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ over the update-independent part of the delta query. Then, the computation of $\delta Q_{R_l S_h T_l}$ amounts to a constant-time look-up in that view. The second row of Figure 20 visualizes the hypergraphs of all delta skew-aware views for which IVM^ϵ uses auxiliary views to enable delta computation under an update δR_r in sublinear time.

H.1.3 Delta Evaluation Strategies

For each skew-aware or auxiliary view given in Figure 18 and a single-tuple update to a relation occurring in the view, we define an evaluation strategy to compute the delta view. We express an evaluation strategy as a count query where the order of the relations from left to right defines the nesting structure of the loops iterating over the relations. Figure 19 gives for each view including a relation (part) $R_r \in \text{parts}(R)$, the evaluation strategy to compute the delta of the view under an update $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$. Figure 20 categorizes the hypergraphs of delta skew-aware views according to the type of evaluation strategies. If we replace the relation symbols R , S and T in Figure 19 by S , T and R , respectively, we obtain the evaluation strategies under updates to relation S . Replacing R , S and T by T , R and S , respectively, results in the evaluation strategies under updates to T .

We give the interpretation of some exemplary evaluation strategies from Figure 19.

- The evaluation strategy to compute the delta of $Q_{R_r S_l T_l}$ under $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$ with $R_r \in \text{parts}(R)$ is $\delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$. In order to compute the sum, the strategy dictates to iterate over all \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples \mathbf{a}_{ST} paired with $(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_l and for each such tuple, to look up the multiplicity of $(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in T_l . We give the pseudocode of the strategy:

COMPUTEDELTA($Q_{R_r S_l T_l}$, $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$)

$sum = 0$
foreach \mathbf{a}_{ST} such that $(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \in S_l$
 $sum += S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$
 $\delta Q_{R_r S_l T_l}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot sum$
output $\delta Q_{R_r S_l T_l}$

- In case of $Q_{R_r S_h T_l}$, the evaluation strategy is $\delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_h T_l}(\alpha_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$, which amounts to a look-up of the multiplicity of $(\alpha_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in $V_{S_h T_l}$:

COMPUTEDELTA($Q_{R_r S_h T_l}$, $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$)

$\delta Q_{R_r S_h T_l}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_h T_l}(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$
output $\delta Q_{R_r S_h T_l}$

- The evaluation strategy for the delta of $V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ under the update $\delta R_h = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$ is given by $\delta R_h(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$. This means that we iterate over each \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuple \mathbf{a}_{ST} paired with $(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_l and for each such tuple, we add $\delta R_h(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$ to the multiplicity of $\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$.

Delta evaluation strategy	Note	Time
$\delta Q_{R_r S_l T_l}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_r S_l T_h}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$	$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_r S_h T_h}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_h(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_r S_l T_h}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$	$\epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_r S T_h}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$	$R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_r S_s T}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_s(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{R_r S_h T_l}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_h T_l}(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{R_r S T_l}() = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot V_{S T_l}(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{RST_h}() = \delta R(\alpha_{RST}) \cdot V_{ST_h}(\alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_h(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_h(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{RS_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta V_{RS_s}(\alpha_{RST}) = \delta R(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_s(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{R_l T_h}(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_l(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta V_{R_l T_h}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_l(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta V_{R_l T}(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_l(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{R_r T}(\alpha_{RST}) = \delta R_r(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot T(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$

Figure 19: The evaluation strategies and time complexities to compute the deltas of the views in Figure 18 under an update $\delta R_r = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$. It holds $R_r \in parts(R)$ and $S_s \in parts(S)$.

COMPUTEDELTA($V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}), \delta R_h = \{(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$)
$\delta V_{R_h S_l} = \emptyset$
foreach \mathbf{a}_{ST} such that $(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST}) \in S_l$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST}) += \delta R_h(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$
output $\delta V_{R_h S_l}$


H.1.4 Optimization Phase for $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ Queries

For a $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ query, the relation partitioning, view definitions and delta evaluation strategies developed in the previous sections undergo an optimization phase. The aim of this phase is to improve the maintenance strategy by discarding redundant partitions.


Given a view V and two relations K and K' , we denote by $V[K \mapsto K']$ the view that results from V by replacing K by K' . The partitioning of a relation K is called redundant if for each pair V_1, V_2 of views with $V_2 = V_1[K_l \mapsto K_h]$ and each update $\delta K'$, the strategy to compute the delta of V_1 under $\delta K'$ is the same as the strategy to compute the delta of V_2 under $\delta K'$.

In the optimization phase, IVM^ε discards redundant partitions $\{K_l, K_h\}$ as follows. It defines $parts(K) = \{K\}$ and replaces each pair V_1, V_2 of views with $V_2 = V_1[K_l \mapsto K_h]$ by a single view $V = V_1[K_l \mapsto K]$. The delta evaluation strategy for V_1 (or V_2) under updates to K_l becomes the delta evaluation strategy for V under updates to K .

Delta skew-aware views with delta evaluation strategy $\delta R_r \cdot \sum S_s \cdot T_t$



Delta skew-aware views with delta evaluation strategy $\delta R_r \cdot V_{S_s T_t}$



Delta skew-aware views with delta evaluation strategy $\delta R_r \cdot \sum T_t \cdot S_s$




Figure 20: Hypergraphs of delta skew-aware views categorized with respect to the type of the evaluation strategy under an update to (a part of) relation δR . It holds $R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$, $S_s \in \{S_l, S_h\}$, and $T_r \in \{T_l, T_h\}$.

H.1.5 IVM $^\epsilon$ States

We introduce IVM $^\epsilon$ states for 3R queries. Given a database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$, an IVM $^\epsilon$ state of \mathbf{D} is a tuple $(\epsilon, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{V}, N)$ where $\mathbf{P} = \text{parts}(R) \cup \text{parts}(S) \cup \text{parts}(T)$, \mathbf{V} is the set of materialized views as given in Figure 18, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is the threshold base such that $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}N \rfloor \leq |\mathbf{D}| < N$. Each partitioned relation K is partitioned on its partition variable tuple with threshold N^ϵ . Recall that the partition variable tuples of R , S , and T are \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} , respectively.

We derive two upper bounds for each partition $\{K_h, K_l\} \subseteq \mathbf{P}$. In case $K = R$, it holds that for any tuple \mathbf{a}_{RT} over \mathbf{A}_{RT} , the number of tuples $(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ paired with \mathbf{a}_{RT} in R_l is less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$. Moreover, the number of distinct tuples over \mathbf{A}_{RT} in R_h is at most $\frac{N}{\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon} = 2N^{1-\epsilon}$. The bounds for the other partitions are analogous.

H.1.6 Space

We explain the space complexities of the views given in Figure 18. Due to symmetry it suffices to consider the first five views. We assume that the views are part of an IVM $^\epsilon$ state of a database \mathbf{D} with threshold base N .

- Q : Since the view consists of the empty tuple mapped to a single value, its size is constant.
- $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$: The size of this view is upper-bounded by the size of the join of S_h and T_l . The size of this join can be upper-bounded in two ways. Since T_l is light, it can be bounded by $|S_h| \cdot \frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(N \cdot N^\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(N^{1+\epsilon})$. Since S_h is heavy, it can also be bounded by $|T_l| \cdot 2N^{1-\epsilon} = \mathcal{O}(N \cdot N^{1-\epsilon}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{2-\epsilon})$. It follows that the size of the view is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. By using $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, we derive that the size of the view is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$.
- $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$: As $\mathbf{A}_{RS} \cup \mathbf{A}_{RST}$ is contained in the schema of S , the size of the view is linear.

For the remaining views $V_{ST_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ and $V_{ST_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RST})$ the analysis is similar to the latter case. Since the group-by variables of both views are contained in the schema of one of the relations defining the views, the sizes of both views are linear.

H.1.7 Update Time

We explain the time complexities of the delta evaluation strategies given in Figure 19. Assume that the partitions and views are part of an IVM $^\epsilon$ state of a database \mathbf{D} with some threshold base N . Let $\delta R_r = \{(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \mapsto m\}$ be a single-tuple update.

- Delta computation for the views $Q_{R_r S_r T}$, $\delta Q_{R_r S_h T_l}$, $Q_{R_r S_l T_l}$, Q_{RST_h} , $V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$, $V_{R_s}(\mathbf{a}_{RST})$, $V_{T R_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$, and $V_{T R_r}(\mathbf{a}_{RST})$: In these cases, all variables in the delta views are fixed to the constants given by the update δR_r . Hence, delta computation amounts to constant-time look-ups.
- Views $Q_{R_r S_l T_l}$, $Q_{R_r S_l T_h}$ with $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$, and $V_{R S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$: In these cases the delta evaluation strategies dictate to iterate over all \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples \mathbf{a}_{ST} paired with $(\alpha_{RS}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_l and, if the strategy contains a relation part T_t , to look up the multiplicity of $(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in T_h for each \mathbf{a}_{ST} . Since S_l is light, S_l contains less than $\frac{3}{2}N^\epsilon$ distinct \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples paired with α_{RS} . Moreover, since \mathbf{a}_{ST} , α_{RT} , and α_{RST} fix all variable values of T_t , the latter view can contain at most one tuple with these values. Hence, the overall computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^\epsilon)$, thus, by $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$.
- Views $Q_{R_r S_h T_h}$, $Q_{R_r S_l T_h}$ with $\epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$, $Q_{R_r S T_h}$ with $R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$, $V_{T_h R_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$, and $V_{T_h R_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$: In these cases the evaluation strategies dictate to iterate over all \mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples \mathbf{a}_{ST} paired with $(\alpha_{RT}, \alpha_{RST})$ in T_h and, if the strategy contains a view S_s , to look up the multiplicity of $(\alpha_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \alpha_{RST})$ in S_s for each \mathbf{a}_{ST} . Since T_h is heavy, T_h can contain at most $2N^{1-\epsilon}$ distinct

Materialized View	Space
$Q() = \sum_{Q' \in SAV} Q'()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{T_h R_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$
$V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$

Delta evaluation strategy	Note	Time
$\delta Q_{R_r, S_l T_l}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T_l(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_r, S_l T_h}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_r, S_h T_h}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_r, S_l T_h}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_r, S_h T_l}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_h T_l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta R_h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta V_{T_h R_l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta R_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T_h(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$

Figure 21: (top table) The definitions and space complexities of the views materialized by IVM^ϵ for the maintenance of a $3R^3$ query. The views are those views from Figure 18 where all pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RS} , \mathbf{A}_{ST} , and \mathbf{A}_{RT} are nonempty. SAV is the set of all skew-aware views of such queries. (bottom table) The delta evaluation strategies from Figure 19 for computing the deltas of the views in the top table. It holds $R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$.

\mathbf{A}_{ST} -tuples. Furthermore, there can be at most one tuple in S_s with values from $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}$, \mathbf{a}_{ST} , and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}$. This implies that the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-\epsilon})$. By $N = \Theta(|\mathbf{D}|)$, it follows that the computation time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\epsilon})$.

H.2 Incremental Maintenance for $3R^3$ Queries

We show that the general IVM^ϵ strategy introduced in Appendix H.1 admits the complexity results for $3R^3$ queries as given in Theorem 37. In case of $3R^3$ queries, all pair-join variable tuples, i.e., \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} , are nonempty, which means that IVM^ϵ decides to partition all three relations. Figure 21 gives the restriction of the views and delta evaluation strategies in Figures 18 and 19 to the case where all pair-join variable tuples are nonempty.

Maintenance Complexities. We first show that the preprocessing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. For an initial database \mathbf{D} , the preprocessing stage consists of setting the threshold base, which requires constant time, the strict partitioning of the relations, which can be done in linear time, and the computation of the views in Figure 21, which we consider next. Since the FAQ-width of Q is $\frac{3}{2}$ [1], it can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$. Following the reasoning in the size analysis, it can be shown that the view $V_{S_h T_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. The analysis of the computation times for the other views in Figure 21 are analogous. It follows that the overall preprocessing time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{3}{2}})$.

The space complexity of IVM^ϵ is dominated by the size of the partitions and the views. From the top table in Figure 21 and the fact that the sizes of partitions are linear, we derive that IVM^ϵ needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ space.

It follows from the complexity results in the bottom table in Figure 21 that the time to process a single-tuple update is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Following the same reasoning as in the triangle count case, we can show that the minor and major rebalancing times are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\epsilon+\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1+\min\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$, respectively.

Materialized View	Space
$Q() = \sum_{Q' \in SAV} Q'()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{R_l T}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum T(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$
$V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$

Delta evaluation strategy	Note	Time
$\delta Q_{R_r S_s T}() = \delta R_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_s(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta R_h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta V_{TR_l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta R_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{TR}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{R_l S_s T}() = \delta S_s(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{R_l T}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{R_h S_s T}() = \delta S_s(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta V_{R_h S_l}(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot R_h(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_l S_l T}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum R_l(\mathbf{a}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_l S_h T}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum R_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$
$\delta Q_{R_h S_l T}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{R_h S_l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{R_l S_h T}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta Q_{R_h S_h T}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot \sum S_h(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot R_h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^{1-\epsilon})$
$\delta V_{R_l T}(\mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot R_l(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$		$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D} ^\epsilon)$

Figure 22: (top table) The restriction of the views in Figure 18 to the case of a $3R^2$ queries where \mathbf{A}_{ST} is empty. SAV is the set of all skew-aware views of such queries. (bottom table) The delta evaluation strategies for computing the deltas of the views in the top table under updates to all three relations. It holds $R_r \in \{R_l, R_h\}$ and $S_s \in \{S_l, S_h\}$. The strategies for updates to R_r are from Figure 19. The strategies for updates to the other relations follow from Figure 19 by symmetry.

The minor rebalancing time is amortized over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|^\epsilon)$ and the major rebalancing time over $\Omega(|\mathbf{D}|)$ updates. This implies that the amortized update time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. Since the final count Q is included in the set of materialized views, the answer time is constant.

H.3 Incremental Maintenance for $3R^2$ Queries

We show that the restriction of the general IVM^ϵ strategy from Appendix H.1 to $3R^2$ queries results in an IVM^ϵ strategy that maintains $3R^2$ queries with the complexities as given in Theorem 37. Without loss of generality, we consider $3R^2$ queries where the pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{RS} are nonempty and \mathbf{A}_{ST} is empty. The cases where one of the variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{RS} is empty, and the other tuples are nonempty are handled analogously.

IVM^ϵ partitions all relations besides T , since \mathbf{A}_{ST} , the partition variable tuple of T , is empty. Figure 22 gives the restrictions of the views and delta evaluation strategies in Figures 18 and 19 to the case where \mathbf{A}_{ST} is empty and the other pair-join variable tuples are nonempty. Since the views of $3R^2$ queries are not symmetric, the bottom table in Figure 22 gives the evaluation strategies for updates to all three relations.

Maintenance Complexities. All maintained views admit hypertree decompositions with the group-by variables on top of all other variables and fractional hypertree width one [12]. This implies that the FAQ-width of the views is one. Hence, the views can be computed in linear time. It follows that the preprocessing time is linear in the database size.

It follows from the space complexities in the top table in Figure 22 that IVM^ϵ needs linear space. By the time complexities in the bottom table of Figure 22 and an amortization analysis along the lines of the proof of Theorem 3, it follows that the amortized update time is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\max\{\epsilon, 1-\epsilon\}})$. The materialization of the result of Q guarantees constant answer time.

H.4 Incremental Maintenance for $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ Queries

In this section we show that $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ queries can be maintained with the complexities given in Theorem 37: $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ preprocessing time, (non-amortized) constant update time, constant answer time, and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|)$ space. We first prove that this class of queries is equal to the class of non-hierarchical 3R queries. From this, the above complexity results follow immediately [5]. We then show that the general IVM^ϵ strategy presented in Appendix H.1 recovers the same complexity results when restricted to $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ queries and optimized as described in Appendix H.1.4.

Hierarchical 3R Queries. We recall the definition of hierarchical queries [10]. Given a variable A , we denote by $\text{rels}(A)$, the set of all relation symbols containing A in their schemas. A query is called hierarchical if for each pair of variables A and B , it holds $\text{rels}(A) \subseteq \text{rels}(B)$, $\text{rels}(B) \subseteq \text{rels}(A)$, or $\text{rels}(A) \cap \text{rels}(B) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 41. *A 3R query is hierarchical if and only if it is a $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ query.*

Proof. The “if”-direction. We consider a $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ query of the form

$$Q() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{RST}),$$

where the pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are empty and all other variable tuples are possibly nonempty. Cases where other pair-join variable tuples are set to empty are handled along the same lines.

We show that Q is hierarchical. Given two variables A and B , we need to prove that $\text{rels}(A) \subseteq \text{rels}(B)$, $\text{rels}(B) \subseteq \text{rels}(A)$, or $\text{rels}(A) \cap \text{rels}(B) = \emptyset$. In case both variables are included in \mathbf{A}_{RS} , \mathbf{A}_{RST} or the same non-join variable tuple, the first two conditions obviously hold. We further distinguish the following cases:

- A and B are from distinct non-join variable tuples: It immediately follows that $\text{rels}(A) \cap \text{rels}(B) = \emptyset$.
- A is from a non-join variable tuple and B is from \mathbf{A}_{RS} : This means that $\text{rels}(B) = \{R, S\}$. If A is included in \mathbf{A}_R or \mathbf{A}_S , it holds $\text{rels}(A) \subseteq \text{rels}(B)$. If A is included in \mathbf{A}_T , we have $\text{rels}(A) \cap \text{rels}(B) = \emptyset$.
- A is from a non-join variable tuple and B is from \mathbf{A}_{RST} : We have $\text{rels}(B) = \{R, S, T\}$. Each non-join variable, and hence A , occurs in the schema of exactly one relation. Thus $\text{rels}(A) \subseteq \text{rels}(B)$.
- A is from \mathbf{A}_{RS} and B is from \mathbf{A}_{RST} : We have $\text{rels}(A) = \{R, S\} \subseteq \{R, S, T\} = \text{rels}(B)$.

The “only if”-direction. Let

$$Q() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$$

be a hierarchical 3R query. We show that at most one of the pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} , \mathbf{A}_{RS} , and \mathbf{A}_{ST} can be nonempty. For the sake of contradiction assume that two pair-join variable tuples, say \mathbf{A}_{RS} and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are nonempty. All other choices are handled analogously. Let A be from \mathbf{A}_{RS} and B from \mathbf{A}_{ST} . This means that $\text{rels}(A) = \{R, S\}$ and $\text{rels}(B) = \{S, T\}$. Hence, neither $\text{rels}(A) \subseteq \text{rels}(B)$ nor $\text{rels}(B) \subseteq \text{rels}(A)$ nor $\text{rels}(A) \cap \text{rels}(B) = \emptyset$. We conclude that Q cannot be hierarchical, which contradicts our initial assumption. \square

We consider $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ queries where the pair-join variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are empty. Cases where other pairs of pair-join variable tuples are empty are handled completely analogously. Figure 23 shows the restrictions of the views and strategies in Figures 18 and 19 to $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ queries. Since the views of this kind of queries are not symmetric, we give in the bottom table in Figure 23 the delta evaluation strategies under updates to all relations.

Materialized View	Space
$Q() = \sum_{Q' \in SAV} Q'()$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$V_{RS_s}(\mathbf{a}_{RST}) = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S_s(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{D})$

Delta evaluation strategy	Time
$\delta Q_{RS_sT}() = \delta R(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_R, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_s}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RT}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{RS_s}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta R(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_R, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{S_s}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$Q_{RS_sT} = \delta S_s(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_S, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_R(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta V_{RS_s}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) = \delta S_s(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_S, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_R(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RS}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\delta Q_{RS_sT}() = \delta T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_T, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST}) \cdot V_{RS_s}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{RST})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$

Figure 23: (top table) The restriction of the views in Figure 18 to the case of $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ queries where \mathbf{A}_{RT} and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are empty. SAV is the set of all skew-aware views of such queries. (bottom table) The delta evaluation strategies for computing the deltas of the views in the top table. It holds $S_s \in \{S_l, S_h\}$. The strategies for updates to relation R are from Figure 19. The strategies for updates to the other relations follow from Figure 19 by symmetry. The optimization phase discards the partitioning of relation S and replaces in all views and update strategies the part S_s by S .

Effect of the Optimization Phase. It can easily be derived from the bottom table in Figure 23 that for any view V including S_l and for any update δK , the evaluation strategies to compute the deltas of V and $V[S_l \mapsto S_h]$ are the same, which means that the partitioning of S is redundant. Hence, in the optimization phase, IVM^ϵ discards the partitioning of relation S .

Maintenance Complexities. The analysis of the preprocessing time is analogous to the case of $3R^2$ queries. Since for any maintained view, the FAQ-width is one, the views can be computed in linear time, thus, the preprocessing time is linear.

It follows from the top table in Figure 23 that the space needed by IVM^ϵ to incrementally maintain a $3R^0 \cup 3R^1$ query is linear. We derive from the bottom table in the same Figure that the update time is constant. As a result of the optimization phase, IVM^ϵ decides to not partition any relation. Hence, the maintenance procedure does not include rebalancing steps, which means that no more than constant time is needed at any update step. It follows that the constant update time is non-amortized.

H.5 Worst-Case Optimality of IVM^ϵ for 3R Queries

The worst-case optimality of the update time of the IVM^ϵ strategy for $3R^2 \cup 3R^3$ queries, conditioned on the OMv conjecture (Conjecture 2) follows from Proposition 38. The proof of the proposition is a straightforward adaption of the proof of Proposition 4.

Proof of Proposition 38. We reduce the $OuMv$ problem given in Definition 13 to the incremental maintenance of $3R^2 \cup 3R^3$ queries. The reduction is along the same lines as in the proof of Proposition 4. We explain the main idea of the reduction to the maintenance of $3R^2$ queries. The case for $3R^3$ queries is a simple extension.

Let

$$Q() = \sum R(\mathbf{a}_R, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot S(\mathbf{a}_S, \mathbf{a}_{RS}, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RST}) \cdot T(\mathbf{a}_T, \mathbf{a}_{ST}, \mathbf{a}_{RT}, \mathbf{a}_{RST})$$

be a $3R^2$ query where the variable tuples \mathbf{A}_{RS} and \mathbf{A}_{ST} are nonempty. Assume that variable A_{RS} is included in \mathbf{A}_{RS} and the variable A_{ST} is included in \mathbf{A}_{ST} . Assume also that there is a dynamic algorithm that maintains the result of Q with arbitrary preprocessing time, amortized update time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma})$, and

answer time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{D}|^{1-\gamma})$. We can use this algorithm to solve the OuMv problem in subcubic time, which contradicts the OuMv conjecture.

Let $(\mathbf{M}, (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n))$ be an input to the OuMv problem. After the construction of the initial IVM^ε state from an empty database $\mathbf{D} = \{R, S, T\}$, we execute at most n^2 updates to relation S such that $S = \{(A_{RS} : i, A_{ST} : j, a, \dots, a) \mapsto \mathbf{M}(i, j) \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ for some constant a . In each round $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we execute at most $2n$ updates to the relations R and T such that $R = \{(A_{RS} : i, a, \dots, a) \mapsto \mathbf{u}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ and $T = \{(A_{ST} : i, a, \dots, a) \mapsto \mathbf{v}_r(i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. The algorithm outputs 1 at the end of round r if and only if $Q()$ is nonzero. The time analysis of the reduction is exactly the same as in the proof of Proposition 4. \square